The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXII, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1952

CONTENTS

Bishop Ford, Apostle of South China ..... *Mark Tsai* 241

The Miracles of St. Francis Xavier ..... *John A. Hardon, S.J.* 248

The Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate. *Joseph J. Schagemann, C.SS.R.* 264

Mary's Contribution to the History of Women. *E. A. Leonard* 270

A Reply to Father Hartnett ..... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 286

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Obligation of the Sunday Sermon 300

The Confessor of a Sick Nun 300

Assistance at Mass in the "Crying Room" 301

The Funeral of a Domestic Prelate 302

Renewal of Altar Breads 302

Proper Last Gospel 303

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Funeral Services 303

Mass Offering—Ad Intentionem Dantis 304

Pentecost Novena 304

Altar Boys' Surplices 305

Feast of St. Mary Magdalen 305

Third Order of St. Dominic 305

ANALECTA 307

BOOK REVIEWS

The Roman Rituals. *Translated, edited, and annotated by Philip T. Weller* 316

Psychiatry and Catholicism, *by James H. Van der Veldt, O.F.M., and Robert P. Odenwald* 317

FIDES ALBUMS

The new series of liturgical picture pamphlets, FIDES ALBUMS, are written and pictorialized from the point of view of the laymen—spelling out the social implications of the sacraments to the parish community.

Special discount of 43% on orders of 500 or more in any combination of the five albums

500 - 14c ea. 100 - 16c ea. 50 - 18c ea.

BAPTISM

THE PRIEST

MARRIAGE

THE MASS

25c EACH

FIDES PUBLISHERS
21 W. SUPERIOR STREET
CHICAGO 10, ILLINOIS

BISHOP FORD, APOSTLE OF SOUTH CHINA

The shocking news of Bishop Francis X. Ford's death in a Communist prison hospital at Canton which, according to the Red record, happened last February 21, was revealed to the outside world by Sister Joan Marie Ryan on September 3, 1952. The tragic consummation of the life of such a noble shepherd, who spent more than 34 years affectionately working for China and her people, stunned not only the Mission World but the entire Catholic Church as well.

In the total sacrifice of Bishop Ford, the Church has another martyr to the Faith, but China has lost a true friend and a great apostle.

Bishop Ford was put under house arrest by the Chinese Reds at his episcopal city, Meihsien (formerly named Kaying), East Kwangtung, South China, on December 23, 1950. When the writer heard of the incident, his immediate reaction was that this was the most stupid and cruel thing that they could have done to him.

Every one who has read Bishop Ford's writings knows how he always defended the Chinese, promoted their culture and expounded their causes. During those uncertain and disturbed days of the civil war period (1919-26), when secular press was full of gloomy news of Chinese banditry, warlord insurrections, and other unpleasant stories, Bishop Ford always had cheerful events and optimistic views to report to the American public. Sometimes his optimistic reports and contrary views were ignored by the press or published in obscure spaces. He would often protest before us saying: "When something bad happens somewhere in China, it does not mean that the whole country is falling apart." Those of us who knew him intimately well can attest that his love for China was so affectionately genuine and singular that it could only come from a man who had a great Missionary heart and a deep sense of the Irish tradition. Bishop Ford had them both.

His love for China was so genuine that he appreciated the Chinese culture and customs better than most of us did. He also interpreted many phases of the Chinese way of life better than we could. He could see their inner meanings that we didn't see. For

example, when he observed that many Chinese, after having reached the age of sixty, would usually retire to have a good rest, leaving all their duties to their children and even grandchildren, he thought that was the better tradition than that of the West. He would sometimes say: "People in the West do not like to retire." When he noticed that many Kayingers who went to Malaya, Sumatra, Borneo, and even as far as Mauritius, an island in east Africa, in their youthful years, and, after having secured a small fortune, would return home to spend the rest of their lives with their families in contentment, he thought this was also a wonderful practice. In this instance, he would remark: "People in the West have too much appetite to own and control wealth." This kind of attitude and this understanding of Chinese psychology and tradition can rarely be found in those from countries other than China. Because his esteem for Chinese culture and way of life was so favorable and warm-hearted, many times we would have to be careful in making any critical remarks or passing on some joking expressions about certain old Chinese traditions or customs in his presence.

Bishop Ford was captured at least twice by bandits. Once he was taken by a band on the Loting River in the Kongmoon Mission, and the second time was during his journey to Peiping. In both incidents he came out safe. After these experiences he even tried to tell us that the bandits are good people! At one time his mass kit was stolen by a group of bandits on a Mission visitation. A few weeks later he was surprised to receive a letter from a neighboring French Missioner telling him that his mass kit was deposited at his place. On another occasion, he took a group of boys from his first Mission station at Yeungkong to swim. When young Father Ford started to escort them back to the Church, he discovered that a $20 Hongkong bill was missing from his pocket. The boys immediately went around to search and wanted to capture the thief, but he called them back and told them to forget it with this remark: "The money is not lost; he can use it, too." These things illustrated what a peaceful and kind man Bishop Ford was.

In 1925, Bishop Ford received an assignment to found a new mission among the Hakka people in eastern Kwangtung Province. The territory, consisting of nine *hsien* (districts or counties) and

having a population of approximately 2,600,000, was originally a part of the Swatow Mission (now Swatow Diocese) under the care of the Missioners of the French Paris Mission Society. He left the Kongmoon Mission in that year and, in company of the late Father James M. Drought, who was for many years the able vicar general of Maryknoll and valuable assistant to the late Bishop James A. Walsh, its Co-Founder, went to Meihsien to start the new Mission. Those years of 1924-27 may truly be called the truculent years, not only for the Catholic Missions but for the Protestant Institutions as well, especially in South China. This period may very well be regarded as the signal foretelling what was to happen later in China.

On January 20, 1924, the First National Congress of Kuomintang, meeting in Canton, adopted a policy of cooperation with Soviet Russia and the Chinese Communist Party (*China Handbook, 1950*, p. 260). On May 31, of the same year, China established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. Dr. Sun Yat-sen, having realized that he could not interest Western Powers to support him in his effort for the unification of China, welcomed with open arms the "cooperation" of Russia and received Soviet assistances and advisers. Due to these developments the National Government of China, which then had its seat at Canton, was soon heavily infiltrated by the Reds in all its branches. To world Communists, this may be looked upon as their first experience in the now much-discussed "coalition government" tactic.

During those days of 1924-27, anti-foreign demonstrations and anti-Christian movements could be seen in many cities and towns of South China. And there was no exception in Bishop Ford's newly assigned Mission territory. In fact, either before or shortly after his arrival at Meihsien, the Kwang Yi Middle School, excellently conducted and well financed by the American Baptist Mission Society, had its long and costly students' strike, inspired by leftist elements. The school was finally forced to close. Besides the middle school, the Baptist Mission had also a college called Kaying University. Because of the Communist-led anti-Christian movement at the time, the university was confiscated after a few years.

The Catholic Church, at that time, had very little property at Meihsien, so neither he nor other priests were unduly molested.

However, it was a different situation in Siaoloc, a village some 30 miles away from Kaying where practically everyone was Catholic and former French Missioners had built a fair-sized church and also bought some rice fields for the support of the Mission. There, on a sunny day, the Church was surrounded by thousands of students and school teachers. They came there not only to demonstrate, but to take over the Church property and to capture the priests. Father Ford, a Chinese priest, Father S. Sou, and one or two Maryknollers, were at the Mission compound. Confronted with such a critical situation, everyone was in a state of alarm with the exception of Bishop Ford. He was walking to and fro in the Church. The expected trouble, however, was averted; first, due to his calm attitude and, secondly, because of the brave and spirited speech of a Chinese Catholic who risked his life to come out to address the demonstrators persuading them to go home. After that incident, Bishop Ford rarely mentioned the narrow escape of himself and his fellow-priests.

During these years of great discussion on Chinese Communism Bishop Ford never made any unkind or critical remarks about the Chinese Reds. Even after the Bamboo Curtain had fallen on China, he continued to build his Cathedral and plan his Mission programs. In the cruel mind of the Reds, if there was a man who could qualify for their "merciful" treatment, that man was Bishop Ford.

The trumped-up charges made by the Reds against Bishop Ford consisted of "espionage," "possession of weapons" and other "illegal" acts. Everyone who knew him can bear witness that these were lies. In fact, the leading non-Catholic citizens of Meihsien, after learning of the unjust arrest of Bishop Ford and of those false charges made against him, jointly petitioned the Red authorities to release him. They knew that the wrong man had been arrested.

The Reds made known that they found in his files some telegraphic messages sent to him by the U. S. Consul in Swatow. If such messages were located in his office, these could have been telegrams sent to Bishop Ford many years ago when Father Harry M. Bush, stationed at a critical Mission outpost, was captured by the bandits. In that incident, in order to effect his release without ransom, not only the American Consul telegraphed offering assistance and advice, but the three governors of Kwangtung, Kiangsi

and Fukien Provinces, together with the regional garrison commander, also dispatched divisions of troops in pressuring the bandits to return Father Bush alive. (He was finally released through internal rebellion among the bandits.) No one would say that, in that instance, the government's action was "espionage," then, how could those telegraphic messages from the Consul be considered as evidence of a criminal action?

The Reds knew that their charges against him could not stand up. They also understood that Bishop Ford and his many good deeds were too well known in Meihsien. That was probably the reason why they did not keep him long in Kaying. They transferred him and Sister Joan Marie, his former secretary, to Canton and jailed them there.

On September 3, 1952, the Reds "expelled" Sister Joan Marie to Hongkong. Before she was released, the Communists showed her Bishop Ford's grave in the outskirts of Canton and told her that he had died of "natural cause" on February 21, 1952. Who knows how much suffering he had gone through during those many months in the Communist prison?

Bishop Ford may truly be called a martyr to the Faith. He offered his all, working for his adopted country, China, the Chinese people, and his Church. To be called a martyr was probably the last thing in the world that he had ever dreamed of. He was too human and too modest. But some day that title may officially be attributed to him.

About his modesty there was one incident that should be mentioned. In June, 1935, when he learned of his episcopal nomination, his only noticeable remark was: "From now on it will be difficult to dress!" There was no doubt that he had always wanted to live a simple, quiet and unpretentious life.

Bishop Ford had a special affection for youth. He had a keen interest in them and was ever ready to solve their problems. He was at home, when he was with young folk. In his journeys back to the United States, it was his custom to request the passenger department of the shipping company to assign him a cabin where Chinese students would be travelling to the United States. When we asked him about his reason or motive, his answer was: "With Chinese students I can feel at ease and will not have to worry

about my dress." But we all knew that his real reason was that of wanting to assist the Chinese students. In fact, every time he crossed the Pacific ocean, he made friends with them. When the ship reached port, he would see to it that they took the right train to reach their destination.

After he arrived in Kaying in 1925, the first thing that he started was the opening of the seminary. To establish a good seminary for the training of priests, he considered no price was high and no effort too small. At first, he himself conducted some classes. Later on, these duties were passed on to someone else. Still he could find time to give daily private lessons to the writer to teach him Caesar, Cicero, Virgil, geometry and English. In establishing the curriculum of studies, he would follow the most recent rules and regulations of the Holy See. In order to compensate for the deficiency of our science studies, he would have us take special lessons from a Provincial school teacher. Probably he never knew it, but it is true that he and Father Cody Eckstein were the two pioneer-architects in guiding the rapid growth of the Kaying seminary. Also, to a great extent, they were responsible for the many successes of the Kaying Mission which became a Prefecture Apostolic in 1929, a Vicariate Apostolic in 1935, and a Diocese in 1946. The spirit of those pioneering days was truly splendid. It was like heaven on earth. To us who were privileged to be under their guidance and influence, those days were the luckiest ones in our lives.

After the establishment of the seminary, he opened the Aquinas Hall which was a dormitory or center for Catholic and certain selected non-Catholic students who were attending public schools in Meihsien. Since it would take so much financial support to operate a Catholic school, and since government restrictions concerning religious schools, at the time, made it so difficult for the Church to apply for registration and recognition, he thought (and rightly so) that this was the most economical and practical way of protecting Catholic youth and of satisfying the need for education. The writer had been assigned by him to direct the Aquinas Hall for a few years and fully appreciated the value and need of such a student center and dormitory, and deeply admired the wisdom of Bishop Ford.

Bishop Ford also founded a small group of native Sisters whom he sent out to act as Catechists. He was probably the first and the only Ordinary in China who conceived and advocated the idea of giving the Sisters a major share of Mission works. He wrote several articles concerning it. He thought the Sisters could take over many duties that, in the past, had been performed by the priests. He insisted also that, in certain circumstances, when properly prepared and assigned, the nuns could do a better job than Missionary-priests. That was one reason why Maryknoll Sisters were invited by him to work in the Kaying Mission in such great numbers at one time.

Bishop Ford was extremely fair to the Chinese priests. There was practically no discord and dissension between Maryknoll Missionaries and Chinese priests in Kaying. When minor disagreements occurred among them, most of the time he would side with the Chinese.

Bishop Francis X. Ford has passed on, but his spirit and heroic example remain with us all the time. North China and Central China have their martyred bishops, but Bishop Ford is South China's own glory. Kaying's first bishop became a martyr to the Faith; the entire Hakka people, therefore, will surely have a great future. He has indeed become "the King's Highway in pathless China!"[1] *Te Deum laudamus!*

MARK TSAI

Seton Hall University
South Orange, N. J.

[1] From the prayer composed by Bishop Ford on the day of his consecration, September 21, 1935.

THE MIRACLES OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER

December third of this year will mark the fourth centenary of the death of St. Francis Xavier. Among the glories of the saint which need to be vindicated at the present time are the miracles which four centuries of tradition have identified with his name. Rationalist criticism has consciously singled out the supernatural phenomena reported in the story of his life. The argument is that if you can eliminate divine intervention from the life of "one of the most noble and devoted men" in the history of the Church, you logically eliminate the same from the Church as a whole. Even Catholics have been influenced by this criticism. Thus, according to a recent writer, "It is a myth he (Xavier) possessed the gift of tongues. Indeed about the only language he ever learned to speak and write with reasonable facility was Portuguese. It is a myth also that he was a great worker of miracles. His miracles were his patience, his generosity, his consuming love of Christ his Divine Master, his limitless trust in God."[1]

History of the Controversy over Xavier's Miracles

While the miracles of St. Francis Xavier "have always been a grievous eyesore to Protestant polemics," the first significant attack on their genuinity was made in England just two hundred years ago by a Dr. Douglas, later Anglican Bishop of Salisbury. In 1752 he published the "Criterion: or Rules by which the true miracles of the New Testament are distinguished from the spurious miracles of Pagans and Papists." His avowed purpose was to disprove the phenomena wrought in the Catholic Church and of demonstrating that "the miracles ascribed to Popish saints are forgeries of an age posterior to that they lay claim to."[2] To illustrate his thesis, he gives the example of Francis Xavier who among Papist believers is regarded as a wonder-worker, but in reality was nothing of the kind. In proof of this, he offers what he calls "conclusive evidence that, during thirty-five years from

[1] For personal reasons, it seems better not to identify the author of this statement.

[2] Quoted in Milner's *Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy*, Letter XXII, Philadelphia, 1825.

the death of Xavier, his miracles had not been heard of. The evidence I shall allege," he says, "is that of Acosta, who himself had been a missionary among the Indians. His work, *De Procuranda Indarum Salute,* was printed in 1589—that is, above thirty-seven years after the death of Xavier; and in it we find an express acknowledgment that no miracles had ever been performed by missionaries among the Indians. Acosta was himself a Jesuit, and therefore from his silence we may infer unexceptionably that between thirty and forty years had elapsed before Xavier's miracles were thought of."[3]

During the next hundred years, Douglas was followed by a series of Protestant divines who repeated his charges against the miracles in St. Francis' life. Among others, Le Mesurier, Farmer, Roberts, Greer, Venn and Hoffman all appealed to the "generation of silence" after Xavier's death as clear proof that his reputation as a thaumaturgist was a pure fraud. Douglas and his imitators were refuted by John Milner in his *Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy,* published in 1825.[4]

Before the end of the century, the opposition shifted to America where, in 1891, Andrew White, first president of Cornell University, published two articles against Xavier's miracles in the *Popular Science Monthly.* He was answered the same year by the Jesuit, Thomas Hughes, in two issues of the *Catholic World.* White came back five years later with his two volume *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom,* in which he renewed the claim that there are no genuine miracles in the history of Christianity—and rested his case on a close analysis of the reported miracles in the life of St. Francis Xavier. White's theory was that so-called Christian miracles are only "legends of miracles (which) have grown about the lives of all great benefactors of humanity." In post-Apostolic Christianity there are "very many examples which enable us to study the evolution of legendary miracles." So many, in fact, that a careful scrutiny of all of them is impossible. In

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Milner shows that Douglas falsified the testimony of Acosta. The latter is not only not silent on Xavier's miracles, but expressly says that, "So many and such great signs are reported of him by many, and those proper witnesses, that hardly so many are reported by anyone except the Apostles." *Ibid.*

lieu of this, White prefers to "select but one, which is chosen because it is the life of one of the most noble and devoted men in the history of humanity, one whose biography is before the world with its most minute details—St. Francis Xavier."[5] The conclusion is obvious: if the miracles recorded in his life can be shown to be legendary, then no other record of miraculous phenomena in the life of any Christian saint can be accepted as true.

In the meantime, the Bollandists were busy assembling the available data in the controversy, and in 1897 they published a thorough refutation of Andrew White and his predecessors. The opposition never answered the rebuttal. But unfortunately, where the refutation remained hidden in the *Analecta Bollandiana,* the adversaries continued to publicize their "exposé" as incontestible truth. The present study, therefore, is intended to bring the issue back to where it stood fifty years ago, in the field of authentic history. The method will be to follow the Bollandists in answering the American critic who had gathered together all the arguments ever brought against the miracles of St. Francis Xavier.

Xavier's Silence About His Own Miracles

The first and basic argument of the critics is the absence of any reference to miracles in the writings of Francis Xavier. "During his career as a missionary," we are told, "he wrote great numbers of letters, which were preserved and have since been published; and these, with the letters of his contemporaries exhibit clearly all the features of his life. . . . No account of a miracle wrought by him appears either in his own letters or in any contemporary document."[6]

Logically, this objection covers two arguments: first, how explain Xavier's silence about his own wonder-working powers, if he really possessed them; and secondly, the silence of contemporary historians, friends of the saint and his own religious brethren. These latter were not mute on the subject through any "evil heart of unbelief." On the contrary, they were "prompt to record the slightest occurrence which they thought evidence of Divine favor."[7] Yet not a word did they say about Xavier's working miracles.

[5] White, Andrew D., *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology,* New York, 1908, II, 5.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 6.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

Relative to the missionary's silence about himself, the Bollandists call this observation at least naive, which "shows how little the American writer understood the character of Xavier. For as much as the former professor of Ste. Barbe had previously sought for human glory, so much did the disciple of St. Ignatius now seek to bury in profound oblivion the marvelous works that were wrought in and through him by God. The last person we should ask about Xavier's miracles is Xavier himself—as evidenced from the answer which he gave on one occasion when asked if he had raised someone from the dead."[8] According to Orlandini, a contemporary, Francis blushed deeply and cried out against the idea, saying, "And so I am said to have raised the dead!"[9] It is significant that White deleted this episode from his treatment of the subject in 1896. Five years before, in the *Popular Science* articles, he quoted the story from Orlandini, but only to call it a "subsidiary legend" which the Jesuits invented to explain away Francis' silence about his thaumaturgic powers. Meantime his attention had been called to such arbitrary handling of facts to sustain a preconceived theory. Moreover, the same Orlandini is witness again to explain the discrepancy between Xavier's reticence about himself and the glowing accounts of those who knew him. "He writes about his own affairs sparingly and dryly, while at the same time very much is written about him, profusely and copiously, both by people in the world and by members of the order."[10]

Alleged Silence of Contemporary History

More serious, however, is the second argument of Andrew White, namely, that "no account of a miracle wrought by him (Xavier) appears . . . in any contemporary document." The Bollandists' answer is devastating: contemporary accounts are filled with references to Xavier's miraculous powers. Among others, and by no means exhaustive, are the following, all from authentic documents written before December, 1551:

Gaspar Barze, in a letter dated December 13, 1548, wrote of Francis Xavier to his brethren in Portugal, describing what happened at Goa when on one occasion the missionary was delayed

[8] *Analecta Bollandiana*, Bruxelles, 1897, XVI, 57 f.
[9] Orlandini, *Historia Societatis Iesu*, lib. VIII, n. 29.
[10] *Ibid.*

in returning from Cape Comorin: "Suddenly the rumor was spread that Master Francis had died. . . . His friends were deeply grieved at this news and said among themselves, 'Though it should cost us 30,000 cruzados, we will see that he is canonized.' Then they began recounting the miracles, the very great miracles, which he had worked while living in their country. I will not describe them to you because it is not fitting that we should talk about these things, except to God, to render Him thanks for granting such graces."[11]

In a letter of Francis Perez to the Fathers at Coimbra is reported the double prophecy which Xavier had made at Malacca. The first was his certain foreknowledge of a victory of the Christian armada over the Pagan Moros, hundreds of miles away, contrary to all expectations, and at the very hour when the victory was won. The second was his correct prediction of the exact time when a certain man, named Arausio, would die. Perez' letter is not dated, but the context clearly shows it was written during Xavier's lifetime.[12]

In 1545, John Vaz, licentiate in theology and a companion of Francis Xavier in the Indies, on his return to Rome narrated a series of prodigies which the saint had performed.[13]

Another clear reference to the miracles of Francis Xavier occurs in a letter written in 1548 from Travancore. "In whatever town Francis stops, wherever he even passes by, he acquires such renown as can scarcely be believed. I do not wish to write about the things which he does; so sublime that I do not trust myself adequately to describe them on paper. The life of Master Francis has created such a stir that his name is celebrated through all India. . . . How I should like to narrate in detail all the wonders which are related of Master Francis; believe me, my failure to do so pains me more than it does you. But I assure you in confidence that God is working through his means such marvelous things as may not licitly be the subject of idle conversation."[14]

There were not wanting sceptics in Portugal who refused to accept the glowing accounts of Xavier's miracles until confirmed, as

[11] *Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, Florentiae, 1887, Epist. XI, p. 54.
[12] *Ibid.*, Epist. XV, p. 73.
[13] *Ibid.*, Epist. III, p. 6.
[14] *Ibid.*, Epist. IX, p. 38.

they said, by impartial witnesses. A letter sent from Lisbon in 1548 tells how these critics were silenced on one occasion. "Dining recently with the ambassador of the emperor," writes the Jesuit correspondent, "I there met Francisco Guzman, Don Pedro de Meneses and two other knights who had just returned from India. They spoke with such admiration of our Blessed Father (Xavier) that it was clear the Lord had inspired them so to speak, in order to manifest in that distinguished company the truth about the marvelous deeds which His Divine Majesty works through His good servant, and in order to put to confusion the few incredulous listeners who were present."[15]

Among other contemporary witnesses was the famous Don Fernando Mendez Pinto. Leaving Lisbon for the Indies in 1537, he arrived at Malacca in January, 1547. "There," he says, "we found the Reverend Father, Master Francis Xavier, superior of the Society of Jesus in India. Only a few days before he had arrived from the Moluccas with a great reputation for sanctity. People call him 'the saint,' on account of the many miracles which they have seen him work."[16]

This seems sufficient, the Bollandists observe, to negative the assertion of an absolute silence of contemporary history. "Even the few extracts we gave, prove abundantly that, while still living, the Apostle of the Indies enjoyed among his brethren and fellow-workers a well merited reputation for miraculous power. Naturally we do not find in the letters of the missionaries from India and Japan more than a fraction of all the miracles which the juridical inquiry was later on to reveal. But are we on that account to conclude to the evolution of a legend?"[17]

An extant letter penned at Goa by a Jesuit Superior shortly after Francis' death shows how unjust is the accusation of developing a Xavier legend imputed to his brethren and later biographers. It also helps to explain the relative reticence among Jesuits on the subject of St. Francis' miracles while he was yet alive. "As regards the death of our Father Francis," wrote Balthasar Diaz, "there are many people in this city who have lived with him in

[15] *Monumenta Historica S.I.*, Epistolae Mixtae, Vol. I, Epist. 172, p. 559.

[16] Figuier, Bernard, *Les Voyages Adventureux de Fernand Mendez Pinto*, Paris, 1628, p. 1037.

[17] *Analecta Bollandiana*, XVI, 60.

different places and have seen him do and say among the pagans such things as were evidently supernatural and equal to those which we read in the lives of the saints. Persons of great integrity have come to ask me why we do not begin a formal investigation and gathering of testimony of all these things, with a view to having him canonized. However, because I felt that this should be undertaken by someone duly authorized, and also for personal reasons, I did not wish to begin the inquiry on my own authority."[18]

Evolutionary Theory of Xavier's Miracles

Against the assumption that Francis Xavier worked no miracles during his lifetime, the opposition was faced with the mass of contrary evidence in all the known biographies and panegyrics of the saint. To explain this away, the theory of legendary development was constructed. Said the critics: "It is hardly necessary to attribute to the orators and biographers generally a conscious attempt to deceive. The simple fact is, that as a rule they thought, spoke and wrote in obedience to the natural laws which govern the luxuriant growth of myth and legend in the warm atmosphere of love and devotion which constantly arises about great religious leaders in times when men have little or no knowledge of natural law, when there is little care for scientific evidence, and when he who believes most is thought most meritorious."[19]

Fortunately, for the purpose of refutation, Andrew White illustrates what his school means by "the luxuriant growth of myth and legend" regarding Xavier's miracles. He takes three biographies of the saint, by as many Jesuits, and points to the accumulation of miracles from the first to the second to the third.

First, "in 1588, thirty-six years after Xavier's death, the Jesuit Father, Maffei, who had been especially conversant with Xavier's career in the East, published his *History of India*, though he gave a biography of Xavier which shows fervent admiration for his subject, he dwelt very lightly on the alleged miracles."

Secondly, "six years later, in 1594, Fr. Tursellinus published his *Life of Xavier*. . . . This work shows a vast increase in the number of miracles over those given by all sources up to that

[18] *Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, Epist. XXXVIII, p. 182.
[19] White, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

time." Where previously the saint was represented only as curing the sick, now he is credited with "casting out demons, stilling the tempest, raising the dead and performing miracles of every sort."

Finally, "in 1682, one hundred and thirty years after Xavier's death, appeared his biography by Fr. Bouhours; and this became a classic. In it the old miracles of all kinds were enormously multiplied, and many new ones given. Miracles few and small in Tursellinus became many and great in Bouhours. In Tursellinus, Xavier during his life saves one person from drowning, in Bouhours he saves during his life three; in Tursellinus, Xavier during his life raises four persons from the dead, in Bouhours fourteen; in Tursellinus there is one miraculous supply of water, in Bouhours three; in Tursellinus there is no miraculous draught of fishes, in Bouhours there is one . . . and so through a long series of miracles."[20]

The Bollandists easily dispose of this objection. First regarding the apparent discrepancy between Maffei and Tursellinus, "it is idle to make a comparison on this point . . . because the two biographers had an entirely different purpose in view. 'Others,' says Maffei, 'recounted his (Xavier's) infallible predictions and miracles—many more, indeed, than we have touched upon, hurrying on, as we have done, to fulfill another purpose.'"[21] His purpose was to give a *History of the East*, addressed to Philip II of Spain, and to review the progress of Portuguese colonization up to that time. As a matter of fact, Maffei stops at least three times in the course of his narrative to follow St. Francis Xavier alone, and devotes some forty-eight pages to his voyages and achievements. When he comes to the saint's funeral at Goa, he apologizes for not saying more on the subject. Moreover, since the canonical process investigating the virtues and miracles of St. Francis began at Goa in 1556, a mass of evidence had been collected by 1588, so that Maffei was more than justified in not describing "the infallible predictions and miracles" which others had already recounted.

About Tursellinus, it is interesting to note, say the Bollandists, "the change in attitude which Dr. White takes in 1891 and in 1896. In 1891, when the first articles on St. Francis Xavier appeared in the *Popular Science Monthly*, Tursellinus was taken as

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 14 ff.

[21] *Analecta Bollandiana*, p. 61.

the point of departure for the evolution of the legend; and Dr. White asserted that Tursellinus' life contained 'scarcely any miracles.' "[22] Meantime Thomas Hughes had refuted this assertion by showing with documentary evidence that Tursellinus "at the genesis of the myth" actually gives an account of no less than fifty-one reported miracles worked by Francis during his life in the East.[23] Consequently, in 1896, the saint's critic replaces Tursellinus with Maffei, as heading the legend. And instead of "scarcely any miracles," Tursellinus now "shows a vast increase in the number of miracles over those given by all sources together up to that time."[24]

Bouhours wrote his biography in 1682, in which he is supposed to have "enormously amplified and multiplied" the miracles attributed to Xavier by earlier biographers. The implication is unwarranted, and that on two scores: because it assumes that "Bouhours, writing ninety years after Tursellinus, could not have had access to any new sources," and because it confuses the miracles worked by St. Francis during his own lifetime with those worked after his death, but through his intercession.

The objection is made that "Xavier had been dead one hundred and thirty years, and, of course, all the natives upon whom he had wrought his miracles, and their children and grandchildren, were gone."[25] Therefore, it is argued, Bouhours drew on his imagination to improve on Tursellinus. In reality, Bouhours had a wealth of information, juridically accredited, to which Tursellinus had no access because it was not yet accumulated. As noted before, the canonical investigation into Xavier's life and miracles began at Goa in 1556, and was not completed until 1616, at Pamplona. Xavier was beatified in 1619, and canonized in 1623. In the interval, literally hundreds of persons gave their sworn testimony to having personally experienced, or seen, or received from trustworthy witnesses, an account of certain extraordinary phenomena worked by Francis Xavier. The bare summary of this testimony covers 506 pages in the *Monumenta Xaveriana*. Indicative of the first hand character of the information are the following attestations, taken in sequence, from the Episcopal Process held at Cochin in 1616:

[22] *Ibid.*
[23] *Catholic World*, Sept., 1891, pp. 840 f.
[24] White, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

A merchant who testified that he was ninety-eight years old, had known Francis Xavier since his eleventh year, and had been his servant companion on various journeys, among other phenomena related how on one occasion the missionary saved the crew of a ship on which he was sailing. They had been without fresh water for three weeks and were near death of thirst. Francis ordered a quantity of sea water to be brought up, blessed it, and gave them to drink. The water was perfectly fresh.[26]

A widow, over eighty years old, testified to the sudden cessation of the plague, the day that Xavier's body was brought to Malacca. She was fifteen years old at the time. For weeks before, many people had been dying of the plague every day. But from the day the body touched port, not one person died of the disease, which simply disappeared.[27]

The next was also a widow over eighty, who, among other things, testified that when she was only eleven years old she saw and heard the missionary. He was already then regarded as a saint, and "great miracles were universally (*communiter*) attributed to him."[28]

The following four witnesses gave their ages as 120, 75, over 70, and over 100—and so on, down the process, which in this one city numbered sixty-three sworn testimonies, mostly from persons who had lived and worked with Francis Xavier.

However, it was not only that Bouhours had more evidence at hand than was available to earlier biographers, but many of the phenomena which he relates occurred not during Xavier's life but after his death. So there could be no question of previous biographies narrating events that had not yet taken place. In the Bull of Canonization alone, there are listed and detailed eight miraculous events, attested as having been worked through the intercession of St. Francis after 1552. They are, in order: restoration of limbs withered since birth; resuscitation to life of a child about to be buried; sight to a blind man; a leper healed; bleeding internal tumor cured; cancer of the breast healed; ulcerous legs restored to normal; and a blind paralytic instantly recovering sight and the use of his limbs.[29]

[26] *Monumenta Xaveriana*, Processus Cocinensis, II, 449.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 451.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 453.
[29] *Ibid.*, Bulla Canonizationis, pp. 716-22.

St. Francis Xavier's Gift of Tongues

Among the miracles attributed to Francis Xavier, his reputed gift of tongues is especially called into question. "Throughout his letters," say the critics, "Xavier constantly dwells upon his difficulties with the various languages of the different tribes among whom he went. He tells us how he surmounted these difficulties: sometimes by learning just enough of a language to translate into it some of the main Church formulas; sometimes by getting the help of others to patch together some pious teachings to be learned by rote; sometimes by employing interpreters; and sometimes by a mixture of various dialects, and even by signs." So much for history. Now the legend. "But during the canonization proceedings at Rome, in the speeches then made, and finally in the papal bull, great stress was laid upon the fact that Xavier possessed the gift of tongues."[30]

This criticism was a particularly unhappy one, since it had already been made and disposed of at the process of canonization three centuries before. The whole account is given by Benedict XIV in his treatise on Heroic Virtue:

At the Roman investigation into the life of Francis Xavier, a certain theologian, Jacob Picenino, argued against Xavier's supposed gift of tongues by quoting those passages in his letters where he tells how much effort he expended in learning the language of his prospective converts. Picenino was answered by Cardinal Gotti, who defended Xavier's gift of tongues by making two distinctions:

It is not only consistent with the operations of grace, but required that a person use all the human means at his disposal to achieve a given end. In the instance, it is a positive argument in favor of the charisma that Xavier should have studied and otherwise made an effort to acquire a new language, since not to have done so would have been imprudence, not to say presumption.

Authentic sources do not say that St. Francis possessed the gift of tongues early in the apostolate. This would be consistent, said the Cardinal, with what happened in the case of the Apostles, upon whom the gift of tongues was divinely bestowed, not immediately

[30] White, *op. cit.*, pp. 19 f.

when they were called by Christ, but only after the descent of the Holy Ghost.[31]

Moreover, as appears in the Acta of the Canonization, there was no claim that the charisma in question was either a permanent or constant possession. Ultra-conservatives, quoted by the Bollandists, would reduce to perhaps two occasions when St. Francis was understood by different people in their own language: once at Travancor and again at Amanguci. The Bull of Canonization seems to favor this position, when it says, "Sometimes (*quandoque*) it happened that when he was addressing a gathering of people from different nations, each listener understood him in the language in which he was born."[32] On the other hand, the report of Auditors of the Rota favors the opposite opinion. "Xavier," it says, "was illustrious for the gift of tongues, for he spoke with elegance and fluency the languages, which he had never learnt, of different nations, to whom he went for the sake of preaching the Gospel, just as if he had been born and bred among them; and it happened not infrequently, that while he was preaching, men of diverse nations heard him speak each in his own language."[33]

The Mind of the Church on Xavier's Miracles

To answer non-Catholic criticism of Xavier's miracles, it is enough to appeal to the evidence of contemporary history. But Catholics have also another norm by which to pass judgment in the matter—the declarations of ecclesiastical authority. Here the evidence is most conclusive. For every official statement of the Church on the subject credits the Apostle of the Indies with thaumaturgic powers that are not only considered real, but so extraordinary that, with the possible exception of Francis of Assisi and Anthony of Padua, they are unique in the history of Christian hagiography.

Thus in the Brief of Beatification, issued in 1619 by Pope Paul V, he declares that "Francis Xavier, during his life as a priest, was endowed by the Lord with many and outstanding (*multis et eximiis*) gifts of virtue, of grace and of miracles."[34]

[31] Pope Benedict XIV, *Heroic Virtue*, London, 1852, III, 225.
[32] *Monumenta Xaveriana*, p. 710.
[33] Pope Benedict XIV, *loc. cit.*
[34] *Monumenta Xaveriana*, Breve Beatificationis, p. 680.

In the Allocution of 1622, when Gregory XV in a private Consistory proposed to the Cardinals that Francis Xavier should be canonized, he said: "In as much as holiness of life, a reputation for miracles (*claritudo miraculorum*) and the desires of the people concur in their judgment on this remarkable man, the true Apostle of the Indies, it is expedient that he should be raised to the honors of sainthood."[35] The Cardinals who assisted, individually, gave their judgment, in writing, on whether Xavier should be canonized. Their votes are only a paragraph each, some less than fifty words, yet all of them, and mostly in explicit terms, refer to his *claritudo miraculorum* as a sure sign that the Holy Spirit desires His servant to be honored as a saint.

According to Cardinal a Monte, "He shone with the splendor of many miracles."[36] And Bandini, "He drew the hardened hearts of men to the true faith by innumerable miracles."[37] Cardinal Ginnasii, "By the power of God, he healed the sick, raised the dead, spoke with the gift of tongues."[38] Cardinal Millini, "He was resplendent with so many and such great miracles that I believe he may without hesitation be entered by Your Holiness in the catalog of the saints."[39]

In the Bull of Canonization issued by Urban VIII on August 6, 1623, the miracles of St. Francis make up the bulk of the nineteen pages, in folio, of the papal document. Regarding the phenomena which happened during the saint's life, the Pope says, in general, that "He was found worthy to be richly endowed with apostolic charismata; the evidence of his apostolate being manifested . . . in signs and prodigies and powers."[40] Then follows a careful description of eighteen miracles in the life of St. Francis which the Church accepted as authentic:

Omitting those already mentioned, the first phenomenon noted in the document was the gift of rapture. While celebrating Mass, Xavier was often so rapt in ecstasy that those in attendance could with difficulty rouse him back to normal consciousness.[41]

At other times during the Holy Sacrifice, he was seen raised from the ground a cubit and more so that "while seeing the great-

[35] *Ibid.*, Acta in Consistorio Semipublico, p. 687.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 688.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 689.
[38] *Ibid.*
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 690.
[40] *Ibid.*, Bulla Canonizationis, p. 705.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 708.

ness of the miracle, the people might acknowledge the sanctity of the servant of God."[42]

After his arrival in the Indies, one of the "more outstanding prodigies which he wrought for the edification of the faithful," occurred when a mob of pagan Badages made a surprise attack on a Christian village, intending to kill the inhabitants. But the mob was put to flight when Francis went out to meet them, accompanied by a mysterious figure whose majesty and splendor terrified the assailants. [43]

At Comorin, when the pagans were not moved by his words, Xavier asked that a tomb which had been sealed the day before should be opened. Then indicating that this would be a sign of God's approval of Christianity, he called to the body to rise. The dead man came to life, with hundreds of natives embracing the faith as a consequence.[44]

In the same city on another occasion, Francis healed a beggar with ulcerous legs when in a burst of heroism he drank the putrid water in which the running sores had been washed.[45]

Also in east India, Xavier brought back to life a young man who had died of a pestilential fever, and was being carried to the cemetery.[46]

In the city of Combutura, a boy had fallen into a deep well and drowned. His body was later brought up to the surface. Francis prayed over the dead child and then, "taking it by the hand, ordered it in the name of Jesus Christ to rise. Immediately the boy returned to life."[47]

In Japan, a merchant, blind for years, was given back his sight when Francis recited the Gospels and made the sign of the cross over his head.[48]

On one occasion, a small crucifix which the missionary had lost in the ocean was restored to him by a sea crab when he reached the shore.[49]

[42] *Ibid.*
[43] *Ibid.*, p. 710.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 711.
[47] *Ibid.*
[48] *Ibid.*
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 713.

Again out at sea during a storm, the landing boat of the ship on which he was sailing was torn from its mooring and lost in the waves. Three days later, in answer to Xavier's prayers, the boat floated back to the ship and rested alongside the hulk, ready for landing, as though nothing had happened.[50]

As examples of his prophetic powers, Francis predicted the fate of two ships sailing out of port—that one would be destroyed in a storm and the other, a smaller and older vessel, would reach its destination in safety. At another time, as he arrived at the altar for Mass, he suddenly turned to the people and asked them to pray for the soul of a wine merchant who had just died, at a distance of twelve days' journey away. He also promised a generous benefactor that God would reward him by telling him the time of his death. Years later, in apparent good health, the man was suddenly forewarned and died in the peace of God.[51]

Since his canonization in 1623, a series of new honors has been conferred on Francis Xavier by the Holy See, culminating in his declaration in 1922 as the heavenly patron of all Catholic Missions. And consistently the Roman Pontiffs, in their letters and decrees, have emphasized in a singular way his extraordinary gift of miracles and prophecies.

Thus Alexander VII, shortly after Xavier's canonization, authorized the following insertion to be made in the Roman Martyrology for the third of December: ". . . the Apostle of the Indies was conspicuous in the number of infidels he converted to Christ, and in the greatness of his miracles, especially in raising the dead to life and in the spirit of prophecy."[52]

And more recently, Pope Pius XI, on the third centenary of St. Francis' canonization, described the "Heavenly Patron of the Propagation of the Faith" as one who, "in the interest of souls, many times traversed vast expanses of land and sea, was the first to bring the name of Christ to the nation of Japan, suffered many dangers and underwent incredible trials, administered the saving

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 712.
[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 713 ff.
[52] *Ibid.*, Elogium S. Xaverii Inserendum Martyrologio Romano, p. 727.

waters of Baptism to countless souls, and performed innumerable miracles of every kind (*infinita omne genus portenta*)."[53]

In the light of all the evidence, therefore, scientific as seen in the canonical processes, and authoritative as shown in the statements of the Church, it is impossible to deny to Francis Xavier the title which posterity has given to him, of "the wonder-worker of modern Christianity." The miracles which he worked, the Bollandists conclude, are disconcerting only to those who deny the supernatural. To anyone else, they are a fulfillment of Christ's promise to His disciples: "In My name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak in new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands upon the sick and they shall get well."[54]

JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Indiana

[53] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XIV, 1922, 632 f.
[54] *Mark* 16:17 f.

THE AGE OF MARY

We have read about the appearances Mary has made since 1830, and we have studied the various parts of her message. We know that within the past century two of Mary's prerogatives have been made dogmas of the Church. We are familiar with St. Louis Marie de Montfort's statement that God wishes His Mother to be more known, more loved, and more honored than ever before. All in all, Mary is coming into greater prominence than she has had since the Middle Ages. She seems to be claiming our atomic age as her own.

—Don Sharkey, in *The Woman Shall Conquer: The Story of the Blessed Virgin in the Modern World* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952), p. 224.

THE CATHOLIC MATERNITY GUILD APOSTOLATE

Catholic Maternity Guilds are associations of Christian charity, in which the Faithful of both sexes, married and single, co-operate for the promotion of the primary end of marriage, the procreation and education of children (Canon 1013).

The guilds are based on the existing parochial societies, offering the members food for zeal in solving one of the most vexing problems of Christian married life. The guilds are erected and governed in accordance with the precepts of Canon Law and the regulations for Catholic Action. A guild is a "Pia Unio." When gradation of officers has been effected, it is called a "Sodalitium" (Canon 707). A canonically erected "sodalitium" can be dissolved only by the bishop, his successor, or superior. It is not necessary to incorporate a guild under the laws of a state in order that the contributions may be deductible in income tax reports.

In offering material aid on the self-help and mutual-help principle of co-operative guilds, the maternity guilds do not assume a contractual obligation to pay a specified amount of money in return for fixed dues; no legal claims are allowed against the guilds, and all the disbursements are made within the limits of the treasury. The Insurance Commissioner of one of the states has declared: "It is a purely Catholic charity. We have no legal objections or jurisdiction in the matter."

There are several classes of contributors according to financial means: the wealthy, as Founders; the moderately well-to-do, as Patrons; men and women of lesser means, as Sustaining Members. The beneficiaries, the married of the moderate-income and low-income classes, make quarterly contributions *every* year, hence also in those years in which they do not require financial aid. In the true guild-spirit of charity their contributions in the off-years aid the other beneficiaries and the deserving poor. The beneficiaries are called Family-Members.

Genesis of the Movement

In October, 1930, a layman disclosed a problem to a parochial missionary. He wished to know how he could meet the expenses of maternity care. He knew that artificial birth control was wrong;

yet his wages were insufficient to defray the expenses. Neither he nor his wife wished free hospital service. In prayer to the "Mother's Saint," St. Gerard Majella, C.SS.R., the inspiration came to the priest to establish a fund in a parish to which the beneficiaries also contribute; thereby they would be saved the embarrassment of being entirely dependent. In the encyclical on Christian Marriage, promulgated at the turn of the year 1930, Pope Pius XI called upon the wealthy to assist their less fortunate brethren. The Holy Father called for the establishment of guilds (using the term "sodalitium"); teaching also that "care, however, must be taken that the parties themselves for a considerable time before entering upon married life should strive to dispose of or at least diminish the material obstacles in their way."[1] Hence young men and women of marriageable age are invited to contribute to the guild fund *before* they marry, in view of the assistance they will receive later as Family-Members. "The Maternity Guild is based on the encyclical and on the principles of subsidiarity, finality, association, co-operation and organicism. It is not the only remedial agency, but it is an organ which, with the co-ordination of others striving for the restoration of the Christian family, will contribute to the ultimate goal urged by the Vicar of Christ."[2] Some insurance companies offer financial aid. But the guilds are not forms of insurance. We have tax-supported welfare services. But is it the American way, and is it the Catholic way, to destroy Christian charity. No law of any kind, made by man, will do away with ices? Without denying a root for claims in justice from other sources, Catholics (and others) will still do well to practice charity. No law of any kind ,made by man, will do away with the rightness and the need of supernaturalized neighborly charity. Apart from the financial aid, the maternity guilds will furnish a spiritualized stimulus not to be found in other places or organizations.

Procedure

In accordance with the principle enunciated by St. Ignatius, Bishop and Martyr, *"Nil Sine Episcopo,"* the mandate of the

[1] Pope Pius XI, *On Christian Marriage*. N.C.W.C. Edition, p. 43.

[2] John R. Gavin, O.S.A., *A Study of the Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate*. The Catholic University of America Press, 1950.

Most Reverend Bishop must be obtained for the study of the plan, with a view to local application. When developed, the plan and the constitution and by-laws must be submitted to the Most Reverend Bishop for approval before they are adopted by the guild. Prudence counsels conferences with obstetricians and administrators of hospitals. There is to be no attempt to obtain the lowest fees, for Pius XI taught that the mother has the right to the *best* possible care in her hour of danger.[3] The physician has the right to a proper remuneration, and our Catholic hospitals have a heavy overhead. It must be borne in mind that, due to more efficient service, the maternal and infant death rates have been lowered. Furthermore, there must be due regard for the ethics of the medical profession.

The financial aid given to couples by the guilds tests the sincerity of those who on the pretext of financial insufficiency seek to excuse the practice of artificial birth control. As the guilds help to lighten the financial burden parenthood imposes, the economic argument for the practice of contraception is refuted. Hence it is not necessary for the guilds to pay the full cost of maternity care; they help people to help themselves.

The General Statutes required by Canon Law are the same for all maternity guilds. But the constitution and by-laws, based on the statutes, are drawn up in each diocese in accordance with varying local conditions.

The original Catholic Maternity Guild idea, presented on March 11, 1931, to a group of graduate nurses, was then embodied in an ideal plan, which inaugurated a movement, guided and directed according to the original guild-idea with the aid of practical experience.

The first lecture was offered as a suggestion for Catholic Action. It was published by the Central Bureau Press of the Catholic Central Verein of America in St. Louis under the title, "Why Not a Maternity Guild?" The title, "Maternity Guild," by which this movement became known does not express the full scope of this apostolate. The high cost of maternity care is only the initial problem. Other financial problems remain to be solved. When the reserve fund is sufficiently ample, additional financial aid is given

[3] Pope Pius XI, *loc. cit.*

as the family grows in size and the children arrive at school age. The guild makes an initial deposit in a parochial credit union (or a savings bank) at the birth of the child. This encourages thrift. Parents and later on also the children will increase the fund, so that when a young man or woman arrives at mature age a fund is available for a start in life. This is a "quasi-dowry" fund, which enables them to enter the seminary, the religious life, or the married state. In this way the guilds aid, as Pius XI taught, "the parties themselves . . . to dispose of or at least diminish the material obstacles in their way."

In 1932 the National Catholic Women's Union, the women's section of the Catholic Central Verein of America, assumed the leadership of this apostolate. Other groups followed this lead.

The Doctrinal Apostolate

Financial aid is not the only means employed by the guilds. This movement was inaugurated to counteract contraception, to instil reverence for parenthood, and to build up the Mystical Body of Christ. Pius XI declared that husbands and wives need prayer, the sacraments, and the sacramental grace of matrimony. Thus grace strengthens their will to obey and to live in conformity with the Divine Plan. It is unfortunately true that all too many couples shirk their duty "to raise up fellow-citizens of the Saints, and members of God's household, that the worshipers of God and our Saviour may daily increase."[4] Instruction is needed. The guilds have been co-ordinated with the parochial confraternities of Christian Doctrine, with the Cana and Pre-Cana Conferences, and the Marriage Preparation Forums based on the Ottawa Plan. Questionnaires sent to the Reverend Cana Directors brought statements from a majority of those polled that there is serious need of the maternity guilds to round out the program of the conferences, and that the conferences can help to publicize and establish guilds.[5] For the physical well-being of mother and child the guilds have libraries of instructive pamphlets on maternity, infant and child care, furnished gratis by the Children's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 7, 15, 34.

[5] Gavin, *op. cit.*

The Guilds in Action

The first guild was established in 1932, in St. Joseph's Parish, San Antonio, Texas, by the Catholic Women's Union. Since then some fifty guilds have been founded and are functioning in the states of Texas, Arizona, California, Louisiana, Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania. Additional guilds are in process of formation. A guild was formed in 1933 in Johannesburg, South Africa.

All the guilds have accumulated reserve funds and have given aid to more than 2,000 couples. Several guilds reported that they have assisted the same couples, three, four, five, and six times, proving that this apostolate has checked the growth of the evil practice of contraception. All the guilds provide layettes. In St. Alphonsus Parish, Grand Rapids, Michigan, eight groups meet every week to prepare layettes. In that city several parishes are planning the erection of guilds, assisted by the Rev. Pastor of St. Alphonsus Church.

The doctrinal apostolate of the guilds is promoted by lectures and discussions of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, notably at St. Louis, Missouri. The city-wide guild in Pittsburgh is based at the Shrine Church of St. Mary of Mercy, the headquarters of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. Folders explaining in catechetical form the condemnation of contraception and the dignity of parenthood were mailed by this guild to all couples whose names appeared in the marriage license lists. Time was also obtained on the radio to refute the broadcast of the advocates of contraception. Later on, the chairman of the birth control league was refuted in a radio debate. Every week throughout the year this guild conducts a marriage forum attended by 150 couples. The good work done by Catholic maternity guilds since 1932 shows that there is no limit to the Christian charity of the Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate.

Approval

Forty-two Bishops in the United States have approved the maternity guild movement. On May 23, 1950, at a private audience, a distinguished layman who had been interested in this movement since its inception offered the Holy Father a copy of the brochure, "The Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate," published with eccle-

siastical approbation by the Central Bureau of the Central Verein in St. Louis. Pope Pius XII, who is interested in all religious movements in the United States, read several pages of the brochure, saying as he blessed it: "Wonderful! Wonderful!" His Holiness bestowed the Apostolic Blessing (to quote the document) "upon the Catholic Maternity Guild Apostolate, so urgent and so appropriate to our times, and upon all who co-operate in attaining its noble objectives."

JOSEPH J. SCHAGEMANN, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for October, 1902, entitled "Rosmini," is contributed by Fr. T. B. Scannell, D.D., of Folkestone, England. He gives an interesting account of that extraordinary man, Antonio Rosmini, who lived in the first half of the nineteenth century, and strove so zealously to promote the cause of the Church. He founded the Order of Charity, was highly approved by the Holy See for a time, and even had his robes prepared for the dignity of the cardinalate which seemed assured—but then fell into disfavor. . . . An article on the rational proof of the immortality of the soul, entitled "Bridging the Grave," is contributed by Fr. A. MacDonald. . . . A contributor who signs himself "Amicus Cleri," writes on "The Priest as Guardian of Public Morality." He believes that the priest, "though a guardian of public morality, is not a policeman with a club and star showing that he has the power to consign a breaker of the law to durance vile. His duty is, indeed, to correct, but his methods are those of a father, and not those of an inquisitor." . . . Fr. W. R. Carson, of Shefford, England, explains the cult of the saints in an article bearing the title "The Rationale of Saint-Worship." . . . A brief article in the Conference section informs us that the various martyrologies of the Latin Church mention fourteen saints bearing the name Maurice, the most notable of whom was a captain in the Thebaic legion, depicted in some very old pictures as a Negro. . . . In the book section we find a review of *The School Question,* a recent work by Fr. P. R. McDevitt (later Bishop of Harrisburg), in which the author states that since Catholic parents pay taxes to the State for educational purposes, it is right that their children should enjoy an equitable portion of these taxes in their parochial school education.

F. J. C.

MARY'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF WOMEN

Christ's teachings on the essential brotherhood of all mankind have had, in many ways, a more profound effect upon the history of women than upon any other segment of human life. Whereas some bondsmen and slaves were permitted through accepted modes of release to gain the status of freedmen, with rare exceptions all women in pre-Christian days by their very nature were predestined to an inferior position in the social, political and religious life.[1] No legitimate means of release from bondage was open to them. Little wonder then that the Gospels record no instance of hostility to Christ on the part of a woman, or that the profundity of Christ's teaching on the equality of all mankind has been so slow of acceptance by both men and women.

Yet, there was one woman who understood and accepted Christ's teaching even before He expressed the truth. Mary, His Mother, strikingly manifested in her life the eternal truth of the equality of men and women before God, a truth that had been obscured in pagan and Jewish tradition. As Christ stands at the pivotal point in the salvation of all mankind, so Mary stands at that pivotal point in the history of women where all women before her were slaves in one degree or another and all women after her were persons in their own right, acknowledged to be equal penitents with men before God. She was the *New Woman,* the *New Eve,* who, confident in her sublime faith, accepted the role of Co-Redemptrix without faltering and set a new pattern of life for all women thereafter.[2]

[1] See James Donaldson, *Woman, Her Position and Influence in Greece and Rome and Among the Early Christians* (New York, Longmans, Green, 1907); and Elizabeth MacDonald, *The Position of Women as Reflected in Semitic Codes of Law* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1931).

[2] M. J. Scheeben, *Mariology* (2 vols.; St. Louis, Herder Book Co., 1948), for brief historic treatment and extended treatment of the dogmas. See also J. S. Northcote, *Mary in the Gospels* (London, Burns and Oates, Ltd., 1906), pp. 25-56, and M. Faulhaber, *Women of the Bible* (London, Coldwell, Ltd., 1939), pp. 141-57 and 205-320. On equality of sexes see J. Leclercq, *Marriage and the Family* (New York, Frederick Pustet Co., 1947), pp. 292-314, who gives a very lucid statement on the Christian point of view.

I. The Cultural and Religious Background of a Jewish Girl in Mary's Time

To understand more fully Mary's historic greatness and the price she paid for our abundant rights and privileges it will be necessary to review, at least briefly, the status of women in the Hebrew culture of her day.[3]

In the family, as a daughter, she was altogether unwelcome, or less well received than a boy baby, and was a constant anxiety to her father as long as he lived.[4] He was responsible for all her actions before her marriage, and in many instances afterwards, since she had no tribal personality and therefore could not be held responsible.[5] She was not allowed to go to the Tannaitic schools[6] but had been allowed to hear the reading of the Law at public gatherings.[7] She could own only what her father chose to give her, since all her labor and possessions legally belonged to him and his lawful heirs (her brothers) after him.[8] He could sell her into bondage[9] or arrange for her betrothal and marriage, both of which were basically commercial transactions.[10] Her betrothal was arranged for her at maturation, or when she was about twelve

[3] How directly or to what extent the cultural pattern of Jewish life affected Mary personally cannot be determined since there is no evidence on this point except as may be seen, or inferred, from the Gospels, which are the only direct source of data on Mary's life.

The various elements in the cultural pattern that are presented in this section have been found to have been influential during the period of Mary's life. However, the sources of data given do not trace each element historically. In general, Biblical references have been given preference. Other references have been chosen for reliability, clarity of statement or pertinence of application rather than date of writing.

[4] *Eccles.* 42:9, 14 and 7:24-25.

[5] *Kethuboth*, IV, 5 (Isidore Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud* (London, Soncino Press, 1936), I, 276 f.

[6] Joseph W. Gaspar, *Social Ideas in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament* (Washington, Catholic University of America, 1947), pp. 150 f.

[7] *Jos.* 8:35; *II Kings* 23:2; *Neh.* 8:2; *Deut.* 31:12.

[8] *Kethuboth*, IV, 1, 4 (I. Epstein, *op. cit.*, I, 235, 244).

[9] *Ex.* 21:7; *Deut.* 15:12 and 22:16; *Neh.* 5:5.

[10] E. Neufeld, *Ancient Hebrew Marriage Laws* (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1944), pp. 94-117; Hazel Foster, *Jewish and Graeco-Roman Influences upon Paul's Attitudes toward Women*, Ph.D. dissertation (unpublished), University of Chicago, 1933.

years old,[11] and a year of betrothal was usually allowed to establish her maturity and give the groom the opportunity to obtain the *mohar,* or bride's price.[12] Her right of succession, which had not been recognized in ancient times, had become established as valid if there were no sons to inherit.[13] To compensate in some measure for the daughter's lack of the right of succession, the Tannaim ruled that a father should give each of his daughters a dowry equal to the cost of her clothing for one year.[14] This undoubtedly increased her desirability at betrothal but the use of her dowry passed to her husband and so was of little value to her personally.[15] In fact, "so systematic and complete were the restrictions and curtailment of the woman's rights in her own property that the richest woman was for all practical purposes penniless."[16] Furthermore, she could look forward to no rights of succession to her husband's property in the event of his death.[17]

As a wife the Hebrew woman was "first and foremost a sexual being,"[18] having been bought for the purposes of family generation and the physical comfort of her husband.[19] These privileges extended to her husband's brothers if she was childless at the time of his death since she came under the Levirate system of marriage.[20] Also "the wife's right to sue for divorce was unknown to the Jewish law,"[21] whereas her husband, as Rabbi Hillel said,

[11] Paul Gaechter, "The Chronology from Mary's Betrothal to the Birth of Christ," *Theological Studies,* II (1941), 156 ff.

[12] *Ket.* 57b (I. Epstein, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 340); Fernand Prat, S.J., *Jesus Christ* (2 vols.; Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1950), I, 44; Neufeld, *op. cit.,* pp. 94-109.

[13] *Num.* 27:7; 36:6-10.

[14] *Ket.* 64b, 65b, 67a (I. Epstein, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pp. 386-387, 395, 409); Neufeld, *op. cit.,* pp. 110-112.

[15] L. M. Epstein, *The Jewish Marriage Contract* (New York, New York Jewish Seminary of America, 1927), pp. 95 f.

[16] *Ibid.,* p. 112.

[17] *Ibid.,* pp. 127, 175 f. *Genesis* 15:3, 21:10.

[18] J. Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture* (London, Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 69, 70, and 508; also *Gen.* 24:60 and *Judges* 5:30.

[19] L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.,* p. 155 (*Ket.* 59b, 61a).

[20] Neufeld, *op. cit.,* pp. 23-55; *Deut.* 25:5-10.

[21] *The Jewish Encyclopaedia,* IV (New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1902), 625. See also L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.,* pp. 200-03.

had the right to divorce her "for any cause whatsoever."[22] It was mandatory for the husband to divorce her if there was a real suspicion of adultery on her part,[23] but, since polygamy was still tolerated, the wife had no legal recourse for unfaithfulness on the part of her husband. To complete the picture of the wife's servile status, the husband had the right to beat or starve his wife if she failed to perform her wifely duties to his satisfaction.[24] And, since she was not considered a competent witness in any civil or criminal court, she had little or no opportunity for self-defense.[25] Her life outside the home was rigidly controlled by custom. She might not appear in a public place with uncovered head, indulge in a conversation with a man, weave in the market place, or bathe at any time in a pool used by men.[26]

Only in her motherhood did the Jewish woman find herself respected and here only to a limited extent, for she had no right of succession. Family property never went to the mother even though it had originally been hers.[27] In the event of her husband's death she belonged to her children but had no claim upon them beyond maintenance for which she was required to work.[28]

In the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, however, we get a kindlier picture of the position of the mother in the family. In Proverbs she is repeatedly referred to as having a right to parallel, if not equal, respect to that of her husband,[29] echoing the ancient law, "Honor thy father and thy mother."[30] There is also evidence

[22] Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 39 f., for comparison of schools of Hillel and Shammai on this point.

[23] *Ket.* 9a (I. Epstein, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 43-44). On change from stoning as penalty for adultery (*Deut.* 22:20-29, *Lev.* 20:10), see A. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus* (London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1896), Vol. II, pp. 332 ff.; L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 210 f.

[24] L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 156, 219 f.

[25] Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[26] Strack and Billerbeck, *Commentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (5 vols.; Munich, Beckesche Verlagbuchhandlung, 1928), Vol. I, pp. 299-301; 423-42; I. Epstein, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 451 f.

[27] *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, XII, 556 f.

[28] L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 183 ff.

[29] *Prov.* 10:1, 15:20, 17:25, 19:26, 20:20, 23:22-25, 28:24, 30:17; also *Eccles.* 3:4-11, 7:27.

[30] *Ex.* 20:12. See also William Oesterly and Theodore Robinson, *A History of Israel* (2 vols.; Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1934), I, 362.

that the mother was respected as a teacher in the home not only of her daughters but also of her sons.[31] Further, the love of a mother is extolled in such ancient stories as those of Agar and Anna, where she assumes heroic proportions.[32]

Whereas the woman's lower social status grew out of the ancient patriarchal system, her position in the religious life of the Hebrews stemmed, at least in part, from their monotheistic religion. From the story of the creation onward through history the Hebrews lifted their understanding of Yahweh far above human life. In their intense desire to keep their religion free from the complications of sex which were prevalent in other Semitic religions,[33] they placed a number of restrictions upon women. However, there is evidence that the women co-operated in the forming and maintaining of these restrictions since they also believed in a pure and righteous Yahweh. Women had assisted in the equipping of the Tabernacle[34] and had followed the leadership of Miriam, the prophetess, and there can be little doubt but that they fully endorsed the prohibition against priestess- prostitutes of the temple.[35] While they were forbidden to study the Torah,[36] great prophetesses arose among them, who, by their wisdom, showed an extensive knowledge of the Sacred Literature.[37] Further, it is significant to note that there is no record of the women contending for extended rights of worship as they did for extended rights of property. They were restricted to a special court of the Temple,[38] were required to sit upon the ground when they prayed,[39] and were not strictly

[31] *Prov.* 1:8, 29:15, 31:1.

[32] *Gen.* 21:14-21; and *I Sam.* 1:2-2:20.

[33] MacDonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27, 37; Foster, *op. cit.*, pp. 155, 161; Oesterly, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 298-299.

[34] *Ex.* 35:1-38:43.

[35] *Deut.* 23:18; MacDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Oesterly, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 368-370.

[36] Gaspar, *op. cit.*, p. 151; Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[37] *Ex.* 15:20, 21; *Judges* 4:4 and 5:1-5; *II Kings* 22:14-20; *Luke* 2:36-38.

[38] L. A. Fillion, *The Life of Christ* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1928), Vol. I, p. 167; Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

[39] Josephine Mayer, *Monumenta de Viduis, Diaconissis, Virginibusque Tractantia* (Bonn, University of Bonn, 1938), Canones Apostolorum Ecclesiastici, c. 27.

required to be present at the three annual religious festivals.[40] These restrictions, like the required period of purification after childbirth, give many indications of having been initiated by the women themselves on the grounds of health and their function of motherhood.

II. The Divine Mission of Mary

It was in this pattern of cultural and religious life that Mary the Mother of Christ was born and reared, however little or much of it affected her personal home life. She was heir to all the restrictions and discriminations against the women of her day. She served the men of her household, and, if she was indeed an orphan,[41] she knew the ignominy of being virtually the property of her nearest male relative, by whom her betrothal was arranged while she was still little more than a child. She was forbidden any formal education and was expected to restrict her life to the narrow path from her home to the town's well or the synagogue. Obedience and silence were her chief virtues. Yet, one has only to read the few historical fragments that record Mary's life against this cultural and religious background to be astounded anew at the power of her personality. For, out of all the shackling prohibitions that surrounded her, she rose to share in the accomplishment of the highest hopes of her race and to give to all women who followed after her a new reason for being.

Her first recorded words spoken to the Angel Gabriel are in themselves so remarkable that their inner meaning is often overlooked. Mary had been told by a courier from God that she was to bear a child—the Son of God, and she, a betrothed daughter of Juda, asked, "How can this be, since I know no man?"[42] In these eight simple words[43] Mary expressed the nascent truth that was, through her acceptance of her divine mission, to change the status of women for all time.

[40] MacDonald, *op. cit.*, p. 66; Alfred Plummer, *Gospel According to St. Luke* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), p. 74.

[41] Prat, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 41-44.

[42] *Luke* 1:34.

[43] F. D. Maurice, *The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven* (New York, Macmillan and Co., 1888), p. 28, brings out the simplicity of the language used in the New Testament stories. See also F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1887), p. 59.

To get the full import of Mary's definition of her chastity, it should be contrasted with the wailing of the daughter of Jephte on the mountain sides of Gilead whose memory still lingered in the minds of Hebrew women.[44] Or it should be compared to such current opinions as that a woman without a husband was a sort of monstrosity, that a woman who refused her husband conjugal union deserved to lose her *ketubah*,[45] that, as Gamaliel summarized it, in the future life women would bear children every day as hens lay eggs.[46] So far from an expression of regret for her virginity or of concurrence with these current public opinions is Mary's statement as to suggest another order of life.

Further, it is to be remembered that Mary had no rights to her own person under the existing laws. Even though she knew that her betrothal "represented the full consummation of the marriage,"[47] she had no legal authority to refuse to be betrothed. Rather, she made of it a new vocation for women. For, while women had been permitted to become Nazarites[48] (though not Essenes), they were penalized severely if they allowed their ascetic vows to restrict their marital life.[49]

Thus, Mary's resolution of chastity was at variance not only with the current public opinion, but also with the Hebrew laws of the day since it implied the right of a woman to her own person. Her chastity became, thereby, not the purity of a protected possession, such as the virginity of a daughter in a Hebrew family, but the purity of a child of God responsible for her own moral aspirations. So profound were the effects of these words spoken by Mary as a young girl possibly just entering her teens, that we, centuries later, are still struggling to understand the moral obligations of women that are implied in them.

Her next words carried an even more profound message in that they conveyed her full acceptance of her mission to become the

[44] *Judges* 11:30-40.

[45] L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 f.

[46] Strack and Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, I, 889, quoting Gamaliel about 50 A.D.

[47] L. M. Epstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 and 73. More extended discussion on pp. 13-18. See also Neufeld *op. cit.*, pp. 142-47 and Gaechter, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-54, for opposing point of view.

[48] *Numbers* 6:2-21. Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 31; MacDonald, *op. cit.*, pp. 67-68.

[49] *Ket.* 71a, 72a (I. Epstein, *op. cit.*, II, 439, 447, 453).

Co-Redemptrix in the salvation of mankind. Again her words were simple and characteristic of her day: "Behold the slave of God, be it done to me according to thy word."[50] They were the words that an obedient Hebrew girl would have used in reply to an order given her by the head of the house—except that Mary lifted her obedience above mere earthly authority and gave her fealty directly to God as a soul having the right of self-determination. It was upon this decision of Mary, the Co-Redemptrix, that the salvation of countless souls rested,[51] and it was upon her self-determination of individual moral responsibility that all the rights and privileges of the women of Christendom have been founded.

Mary's consciousness of moral equality with men foreshadowed Christ's teaching and was itself a part of her function as voluntary Co-Redemptrix. It was her peculiar gift to women. Through it women, for the first time in history, were emphatically informed of a right that could not be given away in a moment of weakness nor be wrested from them by any man. It was the definition for women of the elemental essence of every soul's right to an equal inheritance in the Kingdom of God. In earlier civilizations (and in some nations even today), women had been given, from time to time, a place in the political, social, and religious life of the nations, but these rights and privileges had been those of sufferance or expediency rather than inherent rights of the person. They were given or taken away as the will of the conquerors varied. But Mary revealed to women that immutable, eternal verity which St. Paul put into immortal words, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor freeman, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus."[52]

[50] *Luke* 1:38. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 26, and Fillion, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[51] Dom C. Marmion, *Christ in His Mysteries* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1939), pp. 152-73; Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *The Mother of the Saviour* (Dublin, Golden Eagle Books Ltd., 1948), pp. 180-200; Pierre Jeanjacqnot, *Simple Explanations concerning the Cooperation of the Most Holy Virgin in the Work of Redemption* (London, John Philip, 1868), pp. 17-27.

[52] *Galatians* 3:28. See also statements in the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII, Joseph Husslein, *Social Wellsprings* (Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1940), I, 18 and 31; and Leclercq, *op. cit.*, pp. 292-314.

III. Attributes of the New Eve

There is no evidence that Mary spoke of herself as the New Eve, or that she concerned herself with the idea of the equality of men and women in social relations. There is no record of her raising the question of equal rights with the disciples in the early Church. Rather, there is evidence that the disciples accorded her respect not as a champion of equality but as the Mother of Christ whose radiant faith and selfless devotion to her Son inspired and comforted them in the days of bewilderment and distress that followed Christ's crucifixion and ascension.

As an example of the attitude of the disciples, we find that they reversed the age-old custom of excluding women from sacred religious councils not because they fully understood Christ's teachings on equality, but, doubtless, because Mary was the Mother of their Risen Lord. It would seem reasonable to assume that they included her, and probably other devoted women because of her, in their sacred councils because of the help the women could give. Also the evidence tends to indicate that Mary accepted the new privilege, not because she sought equality of treatment, but because she wanted to help the disciples understand Christ's mission of the redemption of mankind. Any privilege thus accorded her, or the other women, appears to have been incidental to the supreme purpose of establishing Christ's Church. Her embodiment of the attributes of the New Eve was not her mission but the essential means by which she accomplished her sublime calling as the Mother of Christ. To review the recorded events of her life from this viewpoint is to find new meaning in her words and actions.

As she was one of the chief sources of information used by the apostles in writing their gospels, the events recorded reflect her character as well as that of the writers.[53] The source material suggests that she thought of herself only as the mother of Christ; hence, we have no details of her childhood or, indeed, any event

[53] A. Plummer, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 7, 46, 67; G. Salmon, *An Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London J. Murray, 1885), pp. 167 f.; Fillion, *op. cit.*, I, 57 ff., 238 f., 540 f.; M.-J. Lagrange, *L'Evangile de Jésus Christ* (Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie., 1936), pp. 5-10; Jules Lebreton, *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1935), I, 3 f., 14 f., 27-30; G. Ricciotti, *Life of Christ* (Milwaukee, Bruce Publishing Co., 1947), pp. 121-25, 245; Prat, *op. cit*, I, 88, 111; Godet, *op. cit.*, pp. 84, 103 f.

in her life not directly connected with her Son. The story of her life starts with the Annunciation by Gabriel and her acceptance of God's plan and ends with a brief mention of her presence among His devoted disciples on the day of Pentecost.[54]

The majestic qualities of her faith shine through the brief record of her life. Outstanding is the great power of her faith that gave her courage and a sustaining confidence through every trial and no less significant is the great wisdom of her faith that guided her through the confusion of Jewish laws and traditions of her day. It is in the expression of these vibrant qualities of faith that we find Mary assuming, with selfless devotion, the attributes of the New Eve as a means of the accomplishment of her purpose.

IV. The Strength of Mary's Faith

Four events in her life have been chosen to illustrate the dynamic quality of her faith and the attributes of the New Eve that she expressed. In each of the events a different aspect of her courage and fortitude are seen.

1. Her first recorded act after the Angel Gabriel had left her was to go "in haste" to the home of her cousin Elizabeth. Today that sounds like a simple thing to do. We are accustomed to continuous high-speed travel and great freedom of action on the part of teen-age girls. But it was an extremely difficult, and probably an unprecedented, thing for Mary to do. Young girls in those days traveled very little and then generally only to religious festivals in company with their families.

To make the journey, Mary had first to obtain the permission from her parents or guardian and from Joseph, her lord or husband. Then, money and food for the three or four day journey had to be supplied, as well as clothing for her three months' visit in Elizabeth's home. Finally, it would have been necessary for someone to find an appropriate escort for her. This was done usually by arranging for the traveller to join a company of people who were traveling in the same direction. Since she was a young girl, she would have been placed in the charge of some older woman who would agree to care for her during the journey.[55]

[54] Northcote, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-53.
[55] Gaechter, *op. cit.*, pp. 163 ff.

Years later, in telling of the event, Mary recalled none of these well-nigh insurmountable difficulties. She recalled only the urgency within her to go to Elizabeth, who, because of her own experience, was the one person with whom Mary could discuss understandingly the miracle that had happened to her. Poverty, fatigue, and the conventions of her day were as nothing before the burning flame of her consuming faith which expressed its glory in the timeless words of the Magnificat.

She took the age-old beauty of Hebrew religious poems and made of them a new, sublimer prayer to God. Who, reading the regal sweep of her phrases, can doubt the brilliance of her intellect or the years of unsuspected learning that lay behind them? They are evidence enough to show that, in spite of laws and conventions against women's education, she had surmounted the obstacles to learning and achieved an understanding of God's plan far beyond that of any prophetess before her.[56] The power of her faith had made unaccustomed travel and learning its vehicles.

2. "And when she was there it came to pass that her days were accomplished that she should be delivered and she brought forth her first born son."[57] Every woman who has "brought forth" a child has known some small portion of the courage and exultation that was Mary's as she faced alone the birth of her "first born Son." There can be little doubt but that she knew all the details of childbirth and the customs of midwives. She had heard the agonized screams of other women many times. It is also probable that she thought of herself humbly and did not know of her own perfection of womanhood. Yet she sought no aid from midwives or relatives; young, valiant beyond her ken, it was the sustaining courage of her faith in God that uplifted her, the New Eve, and brought her through the miracle unaided by mortal hands.[58]

3. In the biography of a lesser mother it would have been quite natural to find a hundred intimate stories of how "Jesus advanced in wisdom, age and grace with God and men." But Mary, intent on Christ's true mission, appears to have broken her silence only

[56] Lebreton, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 12 f.; Plummer, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-39; Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 65; Godet, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

[57] *Luke* 2:6 f.

[58] For summary of tradition, see Joseph Pohle, *Mariology* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1930), pp. 93 ff., and Scheeben, *op. cit.*, I, 204-18.

once regarding the more than thirty years of Christ's childhood and young manhood. At first reading, the incident of the boy Jesus lingering in the Temple in Jerusalem after Mary and Joseph had started on their journey home appears to be an isolated story, unrelated to either the record of the infancy of Jesus or the record of His ministry. But when it is studied in the light of Mary's consistent pattern of thought, it will be seen as an essential part of her interpretation of Christ's Mission and as an unconscious portrayal of her own great faith.

Christ, like any human baby, had lain in her arms, wholly dependent upon her. She had determined the schedule of His days. She had fed Him, clothed Him, led Him gently by the hand. St. Bernard's words in this connection are of surpassing beauty:

> "He is subject to them,"—Who is subject? and to whom? God to man. God, to whom the angels themselves are subject, whom principalities and powers obey, God is subject to Mary, and not to Mary only, but to Joseph also for Mary's sake.
>
> Admire which you will, and say which is the more admirable of the two, the gracious condescension of the Son, or the excelling dignity of the Mother.
>
> Both are stupendous, miraculous. God obeying a woman—humility without example. A woman commanding God—exaltation without parallel.[59]

Yet, Christ needs must grow out of such human dependence. Each day, the hand of Mary led Him in one less adventure in life until in full maturity He left His human ties for His spiritual heritage in God. Like a milestone in this process toward maturity and freedom from human ties stands the story of Christ in the Temple, going about His "Father's business." Mary reported that she did not understand Christ's actions at the time, but she remembered each detail, and in later years recalled the scene vividly as a decisive step toward His ultimate relinquishment of earthly ties.[60]

[59] St. Bernard, *St. Bernard's Sermons* (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1921), Vol. I, pp. 64 f. (Homily 1 on the Blessed Virgin); translation here quoted is from Northcote, *op. cit.*, pp. 158 f.

[60] The further recorded steps in this process can be traced in all probability to Mary's contributions to the Gospels found in *John* 2:1-11, *Luke* 8:19-21

It is of interest here to note that the way the incident is told suggests that unconsciously Mary reported herself as the leader in the family when she recounted the event. It is she, a woman, who should have remained silent, who cries out in her anxiety. But Mary does not appear to have been concerned with conventions, or with herself. She was concerned with Christ's well-being and her own obligation to care for Him. The intensity of her faith spoke in her unconventional actions.

4. If Mary's faith in her mission had dynamic strength, it also had a sustaining quality that supported her through the years of Christ's public ministry and His crucifixion. She, who had depended on Him each day for sustenance and for help in her round of household duties, gave Him up freely for the accomplishment of His divine mission. The apostles record no repetition of the scene in the Temple with the Boy Jesus, for Mary had come to understand something of the magnitude of His mission.[61] Her great faith stands out against the doubts of His brethren, the inquiry of John the Baptist, and the insistence of St. Thomas for physical proof. Yet nowhere in the writings of the apostles do we find an explicit statement of Mary's faith in her Son or in her own mission. Rather, her faith shines through their record of her words and actions as a profoundly motivating force that gives inner meaning to each event. For each event is set in an inherent background of faith so fully known and appreciated by the apostles as to suggest no direct or specific mention. This is in itself a magnificent tribute to the depth and unwavering quality of Mary's faith.

The supreme test of her faith came as she stood on Calvary and saw her Son accept death as the price of our salvation. Lagrange calls those hours the greatest act of faith "ever elicited on earth."[62] Certainly, in those hours she suffered the keenest pain and drew upon the deepest resources of her faith, for her mission was not

---

(also *Matt.* 12:46-50 and *Mark* 3:31-35), *Luke* 11:27-28 and *John* 19:25-27. Since she understood His mission with penetrating wisdom, she would have recalled the steps by which He left her as His human mother.

[61] Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.*, pp. 116, 134.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

ended. She had still to assist in the furtherance of her Son's mission by her service to His grief-stricken disciples. The last human tie with her Son was being broken, but there was still the birth of His Church to be accomplished. Drenched in agony, she had the fortitude of faith given only to the New Eve.

V. The Wisdom of Mary's Faith

Pure faith such as Mary had begets its own far-sighted wisdom. Thus, we find Mary accepting or rejecting the current mores of her people by higher criteria than those of prevailing custom. She acted counter to traditions, or accepted the current modes of conduct depending on their service to her mission. The wisdom of her choice of conduct is evident to every thoughtful student of her life.[63]

Before the visit of the Angel Gabriel Mary had accepted the customs of betrothal. When she returned to her home after her visit with Elizabeth, she was faced with the serious problems of her coming marriage and the social implications of her pregnancy, but nowhere in the records do we find any reference to Mary's lack of faith in God's plan for her. Joseph, upon learning of her pregnancy, became anxious, but Mary, sustained by the inward wisdom of her faith, accepted marriage as a part of the divine plan. Gaechter, in his study of the chronological order of events leading to the birth of Christ, presents strong evidence to show that each of the actions of Mary and Joseph at that time was a part of a carefully thought out plan to protect Mary from the gossip and censure of unbelieving members of her family, neighbors, and friends.[64] Gaechter's point of view illustrates Mary's wisdom and the nobility of Joseph's character.

Such a woman with such a divine mission would have recognized the importance of protecting it from every possible slander. When the proper time came, she, herself, told the story of the miracle—to believing disciples who had known Christ and did not doubt His immaculate conception. But in all the long years that intervened, Mary kept her own counsel, accepted the conventions of

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 89: "Her faith lit up by the gifts of wisdom, understanding and knowledge, was unshakably firm and most penetrating"; also pp. 91-96 and 141-46.

[64] Gaechter, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-70, 347-68; Godet, *op. cit.*, pp. 74 ff.

her day and made of them a shelter against strident voices and lashing tongues that might have harmed her Son's mission.

Three other events confirm this aspect of Mary's wisdom. They were the circumcision of her Son, His presentation at the Temple and her own appearance at the Temple for her purification after the birth of Christ. Lebreton points to the fact that "John the Baptist's circumcision had been a great family feast distinguished by striking miracles; relations and friends had been present in large numbers, and had afterwards bruited abroad the wonders they had seen. About Our Lord's circumcision St. Luke records nothing parallel to this. . . ."[65] Mary, St. Luke's chief source of information about Christ's infancy, reported only the fulfillment of the religious rite but gave it no special significance since she knew her Son was conceived by the Holy Ghost.

However, as regards the presentation of the Infant Jesus and herself at the Temple in accordance with Jewish law we have added details which indicate their importance to Mary. To her purification she refers only casually. This ceremony[66] had nothing to do with the ceremony of redeeming the son except that generally both ceremonies were performed on the same day, or during the same visit to the Temple. Mary again accepted a religious custom of her people without comment though she knew she had no need to be purified, even ceremonially. Her wisdom outstretched time and race and took to hand all good in each.

Although the Jewish law decreed that the father should redeem his sons at the Temple, St. Luke uses the collective pronoun in referring to the persons presenting Christ, thus including Mary in the ceremony. St. Luke also indicates that Simeon addressed his prophecies not to Joseph as would be customary, but to Mary.[67] The mention of the prophetess Anna further suggests that Mary was the source of Luke's knowledge of the event. The significant details are sharply etched by their emotional content. It is as though Mary said through them, "This was the first hint I had

[65] Lebreton, *op. cit.*, I. 19.

[66] Lebreton, *op. cit.*, I, 19 f.; Plummer, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-67; Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 92. Scholars find no record of an actual ceremony, only of an offering by the women at the temple in money or commodities.

[67] *Luke* 2:22-38; Prat, *op. cit.*, I, 91; Lebreton, *op. cit.*, I, 21; Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

of the pain of the Cross. This was the first glimpse I got of the price of my mission." Read slowly and you can see, between the lines, the heartbreak and mystic wisdom of the New Eve reaching beyond the rites of the old dispensation toward Christ's redemption of mankind,[68] for she was "The restorer of them that went before, and the quickener of them that come after her."[69]

E. A. LEONARD

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[68] *Gal.* 4:31: "You see then, brethren, that we are sons of the free woman, not of the slave; such is the freedom Christ won for us."

[69] *Roman Breviary,* Dec. 10, 3rd Day of the Octave of the Immaculate Conception, 3rd nocturn, 8th lesson; quoted from St. Bernard's 2nd Sermon on the Blessed Mother.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT AND THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

The grace of mutual charity among the living, which derives from the Sacrament of the Eucharist so great an increase in strength, is further extended by virtue of the sacrifice to all those who are numbered in the communion of saints. For the communion of saints, as everyone knows, is nothing but the mutual communication of help, expiation, prayers, blessings, among all the faithful, who, whether they have already attained to the heavenly country, or are detained in the purgatorial fire, or are yet exiles here on earth, all enjoy the common franchise of that city whereof Christ is the head, and the constitution is charity.

—Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical letter *Mirae caritatis,* issued on May 28, 1902. The translation is to be found in Fr. Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), pp. 529 f.

A REPLY TO FATHER HARTNETT

The editor of *America* can always be depended upon to write something interesting when he takes up the subject of the Church's necessity for salvation. He dealt with this topic in 1949 when he tried to explain the then recently publicized case of Fr. Feeney and his followers in Boston. In that article he came up with perhaps the most widely quoted pair of sentences in recent Catholic literature. He wrote that: "They [Fr. Feeney's followers] contended that persons dying 'outside the Church' could not be saved. For this and other reasons Fr. Feeney's superiors took action seven months ago, only to meet with defiance."[1]

The statement that persons who die "outside the Church" are not saved is a Catholic dogma, a supernatural truth revealed by God and presented to us as such by the Catholic Church. It is a dogma enunciated by the Fourth Lateran Council when it taught that "There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved (*extra quam nullus omnino salvatur*)."[2] The *Index systematicus* to Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum* refers to more than twenty pronouncements of this same revealed truth.

It is perfectly true that, in *From the Housetops,* the organ of the St. Benedict's Center group in Boston, this dogma of the Church was misinterpreted. Nevertheless, it is just as obviously true that the editor of *America* credited Fr. Feeney's superiors with originnally taking action against him and his followers precisely because they enunciated the dogma, and not because they misinterpreted it. Their contention that "persons dying 'outside the Church' could not be saved" was actually given by the editor of *America* as one of the reasons that brought about the action of the Church authorities against the people of St. Benedict's Center. Thus the readers of our "National Catholic Weekly Review" were regaled with the false story that ecclesiastical superiors had blamed a group because that group had insisted upon defending a Catholic dogma.

This, of course, was precisely the contention of the men and women of St. Benedict's Center. Indeed the strongest support

[1] *America,* LXXXI, 4 (April 30, 1949), 150. [2] *DB,* 430.

these people received in their obstinate opposition to the archdiocesan authorities and to the direction from the Holy Office came from this inept passage in the *America* editorial. Nothing could have encouraged their resistance more effectively than this declaration in a widely read Catholic review that one of the reasons they had been disciplined was their teaching that persons who die "outside the Church" cannot be saved. The misunderstanding which the Holy Office wrote to allay was due in no small measure to this blunder.

The editor of *America*, in the course of his article, brought out the fact that Fr. Feeney's group had erred in denying the possibility of salvation for persons who had an implicit desire to join the Church.[3] Yet, even here he succeeded in aiding the cause of his former co-worker and in further confusing the entire question. In backing up his teaching, he made the assertion that "the fathers of the Vatican Council taught that an explicit knowledge and profession of the Catholic faith are by no means necessary for salvation."[4] This assertion by the editor of *America* is absolutely untrue.

What "the fathers of the Vatican Council taught" are the truths set forth in the two constitutions, the *Dei Filius* and the *Pastor Aeternus*. Needless to say, the proposition which the editor of *America* attributes to the fathers of the Council is not to be found in either of these two documents. The St. Benedict's Center group must have been delighted to find a non-existent conciliar teaching cited against them.

Not satisfied with the confusion and the inaccuracy he had already contributed to the discussion, Fr. Hartnett returned to the fray with an editorial in the Sept. 20, 1952, issue of his magazine. There was a twofold occasion for his return: the publication of the full text and translation of the Holy Office letter of Aug. 8, 1949 (which appears in this issue, together with its official English translation, in our *Analecta*), and my own review of Prof. O'Neill's *Catholicism and American Freedom*, published in the June number of *AER*. In this most recent editorial Fr. Hartnett calls attention to his previous writing on the subject, apparently still unaware of the mistakes which disfigured his previous article. He also gets around to an "explanation" of the complete text of the Holy Office letter. According to the editor of *America:*

[3] Cf. *America*, *num. cit.*, 151. [4] *Ibid.*

The full statement of the way the Church understands her doctrine should put an end to misunderstanding about it. This doctrine, which the letter terms "infallible," is explained as meaning that ". . . no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ."

"In His infinite mercy," however, God has willed that "in certain circumstances" men can be saved whose union with the Church is "only in desire and longing." Moreover, "when a person is involved in invincible ignorance," God accepts the "implicit desire" of a person to belong to the Church—so called because it is included [i.e., implicit] in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God."

The Holy Office called attention to the way Pope Pius XII had explained "membership" in the Church in his encyclical on *The Mystical Body of Christ* issued June 29, 1943.[5]

In this summary, the editor of *America* is guilty of a rather deceptive over-simplification. He has not given anything like a full statement of what the Holy Office letter describes as the way the Church understands and teaches the dogma of its own necessity for salvation.

The actual text of the Holy Office letter shows that the Church understands itself to be necessary for salvation in two distinct ways, with the necessity of precept and with the necessity of means. The statement that "no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ," is in the letter as an explanation of the Church's necessity of precept, and not as a complete explanation of the axiom itself.

Moreover, the letter also insists that the Church is necessary with the necessity of means, "not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution." Because of this fact, in order "that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire* and *longing (voto et desiderio).*" It goes on to explain that "this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is

[5] *America,* LXXXVII, 25 (Sept. 20, 1952), 583.

involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an *implicit desire,* so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God."

The Holy Office letter then goes on to explain that the possibility of salvation for persons who implicitly desire to become members of the Church was indicated in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* in which the Holy Father "clearly distinguishes between those who are actually incorporated into the Church as members, and those who are united to the Church only *by desire.*" The letter goes on to say:

> Discussing the members of which the Mystical Body is composed here on earth, the same August Pontiff says: "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."
>
> Toward the end of this same Encyclical Letter, when most affectionately inviting to unity those who do not belong to the body of the Catholic Church, he mentions those who "are related to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a certain unconscious *yearning* and *desire (desiderio ac voto),*" and these he by no means excludes from eternal salvation, but on the other hand states that they are in a condition "in which they cannot be sure of their salvation" since "they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church."

After reminding us that this teaching by the Holy Father in the *Mystici Corporis* "reproves both those who exclude from eternal salvation all united to the Church only by *implicit desire,* and those who falsely assert that men can be saved equally well *(aequaliter)* in every religion," the letter goes on to a very important point which the editor of *America* completely ignores in his explanation. The Holy Office lesson states:

> But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect, unless a person has supernatural faith.

The doctrinal portion of the Holy Office letter to Archbishop Cushing ends with a reminder that the teachings set forth in that letter make it "evident that those things which are proposed in the periodical *From the Housetops*, fascicle 3, as the genuine teaching of the Catholic Church are far from being such and are very harmful both to those within the Church and those without." In other words, the Holy Office stigmatizes the teaching of the St. Benedict's Center group as inaccurate. It does not point out the individual mistakes that entered into their publication. One of those mistakes, however, was the teaching that, in order to be saved, a person "must have an explicit will to join the Catholic Church."[6] I indicated this passage as an erroneous teaching by the St. Benedict Center group in the course of an article written more than a year and a half ago.[7]

The last two paragraphs of Fr. Hartnett's Sept. 20 editorial contain some very grave doctrinal charges against myself. It will be impossible to discuss these charges, or even to attempt to defend myself against them, unless the two pertinent paragraphs from Fr. Hartnett's editorial are quoted in full. Fr. Hartnett wrote as follows:

> Unfortunately, the proper interpretation of this doctrine has again been clouded, this time in a recent criticism, by a Catholic theologian, of James M. O'Neill's excellent reply to Paul Blanshard. In his *Catholicism and American Freedom*, Mr. O'Neill called the Catholic doctrine on the necessity of membership in the Church for eternal salvation, *as portrayed by Mr. Blanshard*, "this ancient nonsense." Mr. O'Neill was not attempting to explain the full meaning of the doctrine in theological terms. He was answering Blanshard and his answer was substantially correct. Why, then, has the reviewer in the June issue of the *American Ecclesiastical Review* taken Mr. O'Neill severely to task?
>
> If what the reviewer himself has written about this doctrine were interpreted as harshly as he interpreted what Mr. O'Neill wrote, it would be found to fall far short of the Holy Office's authoritative explanation. By brushing off Mr. O'Neill's clarification without unfold-

---

[6] Raymond Karam, in "Reply to a Liberal," *From the Housetops*, III, 3 (Spring, 1949), 61.

[7] Cf. "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation," Part I, *AER*, CXXIV, 2 (Feb. 1951), 124-43. The citation is found on p. 141.

ing the doctrine in its fulness, he seems to have helped revive the very misunderstanding which the letter of the Holy Office aims to dispel.[8]

Here are three definite charges stated explicitly, and one more implied. Fr. Hartnett accuses me of 1) beclouding the interpretation of that teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation which has been set down in the letter from the Holy Office to Archbishop Cushing; 2) having written on this subject in such a way that, should these writings be interpreted other than charitably, these writings will be found to fall *far short* of the Holy Office's authoritative explanation; and 3) having helped revive the very misunderstanding which the Holy Office letter meant to dispel.

The last sentence in the first of the two paragraphs just quoted from Fr. Hartnett's editorial is a question which charges me by implication, but nonetheless clearly, with having criticized Mr. O'Neill's book unjustly.

Any Catholic, and particularly any priest, can see that these charges are quite serious. The first three are frightfully serious. They have to do with the priestly work I have been called upon to do for the past several years. If it be true that I have brought confusion into the Holy Office's explanation of the Catholic dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation, that my rather extensive writings on this subject are in some measure opposed to the Holy Office teaching, and that I have caused a revival of the erroneous teachings which had been set forth by the St. Benedict's Center group, and which had occasioned the issuance of the Holy Office instruction; then it is rather obvious that I have failed lamentably in my work of teaching the *tractatus de ecclesia* in our pontifical University's school of sacred theology, and that I have misused my position as editor-in-chief of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. Should the first three of Fr. Hartnett's charges be true, then it would be obviously necessary for me to relinquish these positions.

But if, on the other hand, these charges turn out to be false, then Fr. Hartnett has certainly been guilty of bearing false witness against a brother priest, and has abused his position as editor-in-chief of *America*.

It may be objected at the very outset that I am taking too serious a view of what might be regarded, after all, as a mere aca-

[8] *America*, LXXXVII, 25 (Sept. 20, 1952), 583.

demic dispute. And it may be said that the editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* who has given many unfavorable notices on other men's writing, is somewhat over-sensitive when he is confronted with an adverse criticism of his own material.

The answer to that objection involves an explanation of one very basic process in legitimate literary criticism. Our controversial articles and book reviews in *AER* have never attacked the person or the orthodoxy of any Catholic. When we have found some point of disagreement with a man whose writings are under consideration, we have always taken out and indicated the statement or the passage to which we have taken exception, and have tried to give the reason for our disagreement. This I believe to be the only legitimate procedure for a responsible writer in any Catholic publication.

Fr. Hartnett, on the other hand, has followed an entirely different procedure. In writing those bitter final paragraphs of his Sept. 20 editorial, he could and should have had before him the text of the Holy Office instruction and the text of my review of *Catholicism and American Freedom.* He could have pointed out passages in this, or in some other section of my own writings, and indicated the part of the Holy Office instruction with which he believed my statements to conflict. Instead, however, he set out to make his blanket accusations on his own authority. He has set himself up as both witness and judge. Whatever evidence there might be to support his accusations, it is evidence which he has not troubled to show to his readers or to the priest he has set out to assail. His attack is not against any statement or portion of my writings, but against myself, my own doctrinal soundness and competence.

Thus, I believe that there is no real parallel whatsoever between the method of criticism employed in *AER* and that used by Fr. Hartnett in this instance. He has issued a criticism which is primarily personal, but which, by reason of its doctrinal content, absolutely must be answered.

The first of the charges made against me by Fr. Hartnett is contained in the sentence: "Unfortunately, the proper interpretation of this doctrine has again been clouded, this time in a recent criticism, by a Catholic theologian, of James M. O'Neill's excellent

reply to Paul Blanshard." Here "this doctrine" is manifestly the teaching that "outside the Church there is no salvation." The "proper interpretation" is that contained in the letter of the Holy Office to Archbishop Cushing. The "recent criticism" was my own review of Prof. O'Neill's book in the June, 1952, number of *AER*. *Catholicism and American Freedom* was mentioned in an article which was printed in that same issue,[9] but later in this same paragraph, Fr. Hartnett makes it clear that he is concerned with the review of the book.

Hence, taking out the meaning involved in the figurative term "clouded," Fr. Hartnett's first charge is that I have confused or misrepresented in my review of Prof. O'Neill's book, the teaching on the Church's necessity for salvation contained in the Holy Office letter. Only the last four paragraphs of that review have anything to do with the content of the Holy Office letter to Archbishop Cushing. Consequently, whatever concerns the interpretation or statement of the doctrine contained in that letter is to be found in these four paragraphs.

In this section of the review I took exception to three statements made by Prof. O'Neill in his book. The first of these statements reads as follows: "Either Mr. Blanshard does not know the Catholic doctrines concerning salvation 'outside the Church' and the 'priority of conscience,' or else he does not wish his readers to know them."[10]

My own comment was that "Any Catholic should know, especially after the sharp and timely teaching on this subject brought out in the present Holy Father's encyclical *Humani generis*, that there are not and there cannot be any Catholic teachings whatsoever about salvation 'outside the Church.' There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ."[11]

[9] The article was entitled "Dangers to Faith within the Church," and was written by the Very Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. The reference to Prof. O'Neill's book is found on pp. 406 f. Dr. Connell acknowledges that Prof. O'Neill apparently means to refer to the interpretation Blanshard gave to the Catholic dogma of the necessity of the Church for salvation, but he nevertheless characterizes Prof. O'Neill's use of the term "this ancient nonsense" as an "error."

[10] *Catholicism and American Freedom* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 202.

[11] *AER*, CXXVI, 6 (June, 1952), 478.

The Holy Office letter makes the following pronouncement: "Now, among those things which the Church has always preached and will never cease to preach is contained also that infallible statement by which we are taught that there is no salvation outside the Church."

To me it would appear that the assertion that there is a Catholic doctrine of salvation outside the Church contradicts the teaching that there is no salvation outside the Church. The point at issue here is not, and cannot be twisted into, an interpretation of the dogma. It is obviously and definitely a matter of the statement or enunciation of the dogma. I do not believe that an assertion that there is a Catholic doctrine of salvation outside the Church is objectively compatible with the acceptance of the dogma itself in an act of divine faith. At any rate, in this section of the review, far from confusing the teaching set forth by the Holy Office, I stated it clearly and accurately.

The second of Prof. O'Neill's statements to which I took exception in this part of the review has his application of the term "ancient nonsense" to Blanshard's statement that "the doctrine is still official that: outside of the Church there is no salvation." The passage in Prof. O'Neill's book reads as follows: "Mr. Blanshard makes another brief reference to this doctrine (p. 32), which he characterizes as 'narrowness of outlook,' and adds that 'the doctrine is still official that: outside of the Church there is no salvation.' For Mr. Blanshard to repeat this ancient nonsense is inexcusable."[12]

On this point we have a commentary by Fr. Hartnett in his editorial. "Mr. O'Neill," he tells us, "called the Catholic doctrine on the necessity of membership in the Church for eternal salvation, *as portrayed by Mr. Blanshard*, 'this ancient nonsense.' Mr. O'Neill was not attempting to explain the full meaning of the doctrine in theological terms. He was answering Blanshard and his answer was substantially correct."

As the sentence stands in Prof. O'Neill's book, the term "this ancient nonsense" might be said to apply to all the statements attributed to Blanshard in the previous two pages, or merely to the brief citation included in the previous sentence. My review took

[12] O'Neill, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

cognizance of this difficulty, and stated that "From the context, it is difficult to see how the teaching that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church could fail to be included in what Professor O'Neill designates as 'this ancient nonsense.' "[13]

The facts, then, flatly contradict Fr. Hartnett's contention on this point. Prof. O'Neill's statement definitely covered Blanshard's assertion that "the doctrine is still official that: outside of the Church there is no salvation." It may also have applied to Blanshard's portrayal of that doctrine, and my own review took proper cognizance of this situation. But no Catholic, and certainly no priest, could honestly believe or should say, even in the heat of controversy, that it is "substantially correct" to designate the statement that there is no salvation outside of the Church as "this ancient nonsense."

Furthermore, Fr. Hartnett's indignation has led him here into another of his characteristic misstatements. Fr. Hartnett speaks of "the Catholic doctrine on the necessity of membership in the Church for eternal salvation." Here again, of course, he has seriously beclouded the teaching of the Holy Office letter and of the *Humani generis,* both of which speak of the necessity of the Church, rather than of membership in the Church.

The third statement to which I took exception in this portion of my review was his use of Fr. John Carroll's assertion that "the members of the Catholic Church are all those who, with sincere heart, seek true religion, and are in unfeigned disposition to embrace the truth wherever they find it."[14] With reference to this statement, my own review said that "The teaching conveyed in that passage is quite completely at variance with the doctrine brought out on the same subject in the present Holy Father's encyclical *Mystici Corporis.*"[15] The Holy Office letter quotes in its entirety the passage from the *Mystici Corporis* to which I alluded.

Such, then, is the evidence with reference to the first of Fr. Hartnett's charges. I objected to the use of the expression "Catholic doctrine of salvation outside the Church" and asserted that

[13] *AER,* CXXVI, 6 (June, 1952), 479.

[14] O'Neill, *op. cit.,* p. 202. The original text is found in Carroll's *Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.*

[15] P. 479.

there is no salvation outside the Church. I took exception to the inclusion of the statement of this dogma in what Prof. O'Neill classified as "this ancient nonsense." I declared that an assertion about the members of the Catholic Church was unacceptable, because it was incompatible with the Holy Father's teaching in the *Mystici Corporis.*

It is difficult to see how this could honestly be interpreted as a beclouding or a confusing of the teaching set forth in the Holy Office letter. On this point I believe the evidence shows that Fr. Hartnett has borne false witness.

Fr. Hartnett's second accusation reads as follows: "If what the reviewer himself has written about this doctrine were interpreted as harshly as he interpreted what Mr. O'Neill wrote, it would be found to fall far short of the Holy Office's authoritative explanation."

Some comment on this particular charge is absolutely necessary, but at the same time that comment must be an extremely disagreeable task. I have written several articles on the Church's necessity for salvation and on the requisites for membership in the Church. In all of those articles there is not one line which in any way contradicts or misinterprets any of the teachings contained in the Holy Office letter. Fr. Hartnett's charge is absolutely and completely untrue.

That charge is also viciously unjust and uncharitable. I have now entered on my fifteenth year at the University, teaching the *tractatus de ecclesia* in the University's school of sacred theology. For many years I have written for this *Review* and, during the past nine years, I have edited it and written for it very extensively. What I have written on the subject of ecclesiology in the *Review* I have taught in my lectures at the University.

Now I find that a brother priest, without adducing one scintilla of evidence, without quoting as much as one word from any of my writings, has published a statement obviously meant to convey the impression that some of my writings, and, by implication, a portion of my teaching at the University, fall far short of Catholic orthodoxy. He has taken it upon himself, upon his own authority and responsibility, to defame his brother priest in the eyes of those among his readers who are prepared to take his word under such

circumstances. The numerous "crank" letters I have received since the publication of Fr. Hartnett's editorial show that there are people who have taken Fr. Hartnett's word in this affair. It is difficult to see how Fr. Hartnett's action here can be judged as other than slanderous. It is to be hoped that, in the future, he will not accuse a brother priest of infidelity to Catholic doctrine without at least supplying some bill of particulars.

Fr. Hartnett's third accusation is likewise false, but this one has some interesting implications. He writes: "By brushing off Mr. O'Neill's clarification without unfolding the doctrine in its fulness, he seems to have helped revive the very misunderstanding which the letter of the Holy Office aims to dispel."

In the first place, any competent reader of my review will see in a moment that there was no clarification by Prof. O'Neill "brushed off" in any way whatsoever. The statement that there is a Catholic doctrine of salvation outside the Church, and the inclusion of the dogma that outside of the Church there is no salvation in the category of ancient nonsense, can certainly never honestly be considered as "clarifications" by any competent Catholic student. Neither can the statement about the members of the Catholic Church, taken from Fr. Carroll and manifestly incompatible with the teaching of the *Mystici Corporis*. Nothing else in this section was in any way "brushed off."

Again, Fr. Hartnett seems to have forgotten that he is criticizing me for the content of a book review. It was definitely not my business there to set forth a complete explanation of the Catholic dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation. What I set out to do, and what I actually did, was to evaluate the book to the best of my ability. I pointed to what I considered its strong points, and to some weak points as well. I also considered it my duty to indicate some passages which should not have been included in a Catholic book. Two of those passages had to do with the Church's necessity for salvation, and one with the requisites for membership in the Church. The Holy Office letter has shown that I judged accurately about these three passages.

Now comes the interesting point of this particular accusation. It is Fr. Hartnett's considered judgment that, by reason of this review, I seem "to have helped revive the very misunderstanding

which the letter of the Holy Office aims to dispel." The misunderstanding which occasioned the Holy Office letter was, as the letter itself testifies, contained in the teaching of the St. Benedict's Center group. Fr. Hartnett's charge, then, is that I appear to revive this particular teaching.

Now the one definite error contained in Mr. Karam's article (the only writing of the St. Benedict's Center group to which the Holy Office letter alludes) is a denial of the possibility of salvation for a man who wills, with an implicit intention or desire, to join the Catholic Church. Fr. Hartnett mentioned that error in his 1949 editorial and I spoke of it, and indicated the place where it was expressed, in my article "The Meaning of the Church's Necessity for Salvation."

In my review of Mr. O'Neill's book there is absolutely no trace of any such error. There is no statement which could be interpreted in any way to mean that a person with an implicit desire to join the Church cannot be saved. I believe that Fr. Hartnett himself is quite aware of this.

There is, however, another aspect to this charge. Despite all of the evidence to the contrary, there are some people who seem to persist in imagining that the St. Benedict's Center group's doctrinal fault lay precisely in the assertion that there is no salvation outside the Church. This vulgar, but still rather widespread, error was encouraged by the publications emanating from St. Benedict's Center. Sad to relate, it was also greatly encouraged by Fr. Hartnett's "boner" in his April, 1949, editorial. When the highly regarded *America* carried the story that a group had been disciplined because "They contended that persons dying 'outside the Church' could not be saved," it is not to be wondered that many, even among the better instructed Catholics, were led to imagine that the statement of this Catholic dogma in some way constituted the fault for which the St. Benedict's Center group was punished.

Apparently Fr. Hartnett is still under this false impression. Fr. Feeney's followers were, he fondly imagined, subject to ecclesiastical censure because they had contended that persons dying outside the Church could not be saved. To his horror, he found this same dogma set down in my review, where I had objected to a Catholic writer's contradicting the dogma and calling it "ancient nonsense."

He obviously believed that the assertion of a Catholic dogma of salvation outside the Church, the classification of the dogma itself as "ancient nonsense," and the statement about the Church's members incompatible with the teaching of the *Mystici Corporis* were "substantially true." He seems to favor the explanation of the dogma given in the Holy Office letter but not to have relaxed his hostility to the dogma which that letter set out to explain. At least, that dogma, presented in the terminology used by the Holy Office itself, still seems to annoy him.

The fourth charge is the implication of injustice to Prof. O'Neill. To that charge I can only say that I tried to be just. I tried also to be charitable. But, as a Catholic priest, my first loyalty is to Our Lord in His Church.

Where there are reasons for praising Prof. O'Neill's book, I have tried to indicate them. But where there were statements at variance with accurate and authoritative Catholic teaching, I believed and I still believe that it was my duty to indicate them.

Fr. Hartnett seems to feel very strongly that I should not have objected to anything in the book because Prof. O'Neill "was answering Blanshard." I cannot subscribe to the double standard of truth here implied. A dogma of the Church is true, and its denial or misinterpretation is false, in any book or in any article. To allow a seriously inaccurate passage to get by without challenge because the book in which it is contained is a prominent and well-written work, directed against a particularly vicious and malign enemy of the Church, seems to me to be a dereliction of duty on the part of any Catholic book reviewer. It is a dereliction of duty to be avoided, even at the cost of defamatory publicity in *America*.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE OBLIGATION OF THE SUNDAY SERMON

Question: What is to be said of the custom of some pastors of omitting Sunday sermons during the entire summer season, beginning in June and extending to September?

Answer: The Council of Trent commanded that bishops and pastors provide their people with sermons "at least on all Sundays and solemn feasts" (Sess. 24, *De Reformatione,* cap. 4). St. Alphonsus favors the view that the omission of sermons for a month continuously or for three months by accumulation in the course of a year would constitute a grave sin (*Theologia Moralis,* Lib. III, n. 269). Pertinent to this question are the following prescriptions of the Code: "On Sundays and other holydays of obligations it is the personal duty of each pastor to preach the word of God to the people in the customary homily, especially at the Mass at which the attendance is usually more numerous. He may not satisfy this obligation habitually through another priest, save for a just reason, approved by the Ordinary. The Ordinary can permit that on certain more solemn feasts or even, for a just reason, on some Sundays, the sermon be omitted" (Canon 1344).

The Third Council of Baltimore also prescribed that sermons be given at Sunday Masses, even in the summer time, and even when the Mass is celebrated at an early hour (*Acta et Decreta Conc. Plen. Balt. III,* n. 216).

The Code does, indeed, allow the omission of the sermon on some (*aliquibus*) Sundays. But it is surely a very broad interpretation of this canon to omit sermons for almost three continuous months.

THE CONFESSOR OF A SICK NUN

Question: The Code of Canon Law (Canon 523) states that when a nun is gravely ill, though not in danger of death, she may

ask for any priest who is approved for the hearing of women's confessions to come and hear her confession. Does this mean that the priest thus summoned must have faculties for confessions in the diocese in which the nun happens to be, or is it sufficient that he has faculties in any diocese?

Answer: According to the more common view of theologians and canonists, the priest in question must have faculties for the hearing of confessions in the diocese in which the sick nun happens to be. However, from the fact that the Code merely states that the priest must be approved for the hearing of women's confessions, and does not say *approbatum ab Ordinario loci* (as is prescribed in Canon 522 in regard to the *confessarius occasionalis*) some have concluded—and with sufficient probability to be used in practice, I believe—that it suffices that the priest have faculties in some diocese, not necessarily the one in which the confession is to be heard. In his doctoral dissertation *Confessors of Religious* (The Catholic University of America, Washington, 1926, p. 229), Fr. Robert McCormick says: "Both opinions are theoretically probable and so, for the practical solution of the individual case, the confessor can make use of Canon 209. The division of authors on this point gives rise to a positive and probable doubt of law, in which case the confessor can act in virtue of the jurisdiction which the Church supplies in such cases. A priest of the Archdiocese of New York, therefore, could safely make use of Canon 523 to hear upon request the confession of a sick religious in the diocese of Monterey and Fresno, California, in virtue of the faculties to hear women's confessions which he has received from the Archbishop of New York."

ASSISTANCE AT MASS IN THE "CRYING ROOM"

Question: In some churches nowadays a "crying room" is installed—that is, an enclosed room, with a window looking to the altar, in order that parents can keep their young children there during the Holy Sacrifice without disturbing the congregation. My difficulty is this: If the room is soundproof, so that the priest cannot be heard at all, can we say that these parents are truly hearing Mass?

Answer: The questioner need have no fear that those who are in the "crying room" do not fulfill their obligation of assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. It fully suffices for the observance of this precept if the faithful *see* what is taking place at the altar, even though they cannot *hear* it. It is more correct to say that we must *assist* at Mass on Sundays rather than that we must *hear* Mass. Of course, it would be advisable if a room of this kind were equipped with an acoustic system whereby the parents who come there with their little ones will be enabled to hear the voice of the priest and to derive benefit from the sermon.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FUNERAL OF A DOMESTIC PRELATE

Question: Recently our pastor died and there was a certain confusion about the manner of vesting him. He was a Right Reverend Monsignor. What was the correct dress?

Answer: As a corpse the Monsignor should have been vested as if he were about to offer the Mass. He should be vested in his purple choir cassock, rochet and the usual vestments worn by a priest when he offers Holy Mass.

RENEWAL OF ALTAR BREADS

Question: What about the proper rule to be followed in placing altar breads to be consecrated in a convent chapel where Holy Mass is celebrated daily. In our chapel the sacristan places a ciborium on the altar for consecration many days before the other ciborium is entirely consumed. In fact it happens that the second ciborium will be in the tabernacle for as many as three weeks before it is used. I have told the sacristan not to do this but my admonition has not been heeded. Is there any regulation on this matter? Would it not be better to consecrate fresh hosts two or three times in a week?

Answer: In the Ceremonial of Bishops we read that "the Most Blessed Eucharist shall be changed and renewed at least once a

week." Moralists say that to postpone or delay this change of the Eucharist beyond fifteen days cannot be excused from at least venial sin.

The chaplain of the convent in question should notify the sacristan a day or two before the supply of consecrated hosts will run out. Certainly there can be no justification for consecrating a ciborium two or three weeks in advance of its actual use. Most authors interpret the law in this regard to mean that the hosts should not be consecrated more than twenty-one days after they were baked. The Sacred Congregation of Rites and the Second Council of Baltimore have stated that the hosts should not be kept longer than a week after they have been consecrated. This would mean that altar breads would not be more than one month old from the actual time of baking.

PROPER LAST GOSPEL—JULY 3, 1952

Question: My ordo directed me to read a proper last gospel on July 3, the feast of St. Leo, a semi-duplex feast. Some days later I checked with another ordo and found the same direction. Both cannot be wrong, it seemed to me, so I submit the question to you for the reason or justification of this proper last gospel.

Answer: This gospel (found on July 4 in the Missal), which begins with the words *"Ecce nos reliquimus,"* must be read on the first day and only on the first day on which there is a commemoration of the octave of Saints Peter and Paul. Our inquirer will recall that June 30 was the Commemoration of St. Paul, the Apostle, a major double, July 1, was the feast of the Precious Blood, a double of the first class, and July 2, the Visitation of the Blessed Mother, a double of the second class. On none of these days were we directed to make a commemoration of the octave of Saints Peter and Paul. July 3 was the first day on which this commemoration was made and hence followed the proper last gospel, *"Ecce nos reliquimus."*

FUNERAL SERVICES

Question: At the grave is it necessary to have two acolytes and a cross bearer present? Likewise, at the graveside services does the

priest move around the casket when he sprinkles with holy water as he does in church during the ceremony of the absolution?

Answer: When it is convenient and possible there should be a cross bearer and two acolytes at the services at the grave. However, it is not of strict obligation.

The priest at the cemetery takes his position at the foot of the casket the same as in the case of the body of a layman when it is brought into church. However, he does not move around the casket but sprinkles the body in the form of a cross without moving from his place.

MASS OFFERING—AD INTENTIONEM DANTIS?

Question: Frequently, I find black vestments set out by the sacristan on VR days. The Mass offering is for the intention of the donor. Is it all right to offer a Requiem Mass, and if so what Mass and orations are said?

Answer: Ad Intentionem Dantis can imply many things. The donor of the Mass stipend may intend the Mass in thanksgiving for a favor received, it may be for the restoration of a person's health, or many other intentions. Who knows? Of one thing we are certain. The Mass is the Mass and the fruits of the Mass are the same whether we offer a *Missa de Requie,* a Votive Mass, or the Mass proper to the day. Just as it is the more fitting thing to say a Requiem Mass for a deceased person (when it is possible), because of the character of the prayers contained therein, so it does seem more proper not to offer a Requiem Mass when there is choice of so doing and the intention of the donor is not specifically known. If a Requiem Mass is offered, one should say the *Missa Quotidiana* with the three orations as listed there.

PENTECOST NOVENA

Question: Recently the ordo called for a novena to the Holy Spirit in preparation for the Feast of Pentecost. Is this of obligation or is this a notation merely calling this fact to our attention?

Answer: The Encyclical, *Divinum illud munus,* of May 9, 1897, states the following: "We decree and command that throughout the entire Catholic world a nine days' devotion begin in preparation for the feast of Pentecost, this year and every year hereafter, for all time to come in every parish church (and in other churches and chapels according to the judgment of the Ordinaries)."

We are not familiar with any document that has changed this regulation and so the ordo is reminding us of an obligation and not merely calling an optional matter to our attention.

ALTAR BOYS' SURPLICES

Question: Are there any regulations about material for the surplices worn by altar boys?

Answer: Since the surplice is a modification of the alb it should be made of the same material prescribed for the alb, which is linen or hemp. The lace or pleated surplice, of whatever material it may be made, is not in keeping with the spirit of the liturgy. The surplice should not be adorned with ribbons, or slit down the front so as to be fastened with hooks or buttons. The opening at the neck may be circular or square in shape.

FEAST OF ST. MARY MAGDALEN

Question: Why do we recite the Credo at the Mass for St. Mary Magdalen on July 22? I thought that the Blessed Mother was the only woman saint privileged with the Credo at Mass.

Answer: The Greeks gave to Mary of Magdala the glorious title of one acting as an apostle because she was the first to announce to the world, even to the Apostles themselves, the resurrection of our Lord. Ildefonso Schuster in *The Sacramentary* says that it is for this reason that the Creed is recited on this day.

THIRD ORDER OF ST. DOMINIC

Question: I am a member of the Third Order of St. Dominic. As a diocesan or secular priest may I substitute certain Dominican rubrics in a Mass of the Roman Rite?

Answer: When visiting at a Dominican chapel you are obliged to follow their ordo as regards the Mass but you must follow the Roman Rite, even though you are a member of the Third Order of St. Dominic. Regarding the privileges of the secular clergy who are members of the Third Order we quote from their rule book, "Tertiary priests having obtained permission from the Master-General may use the Breviary and Missal according to the Calendar of the Order."

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

HUMAN RESPECT

Human respect—which is but the polite, euphonious name for religious cowardice—holds back men from that wholehearted, undivided practice of the faith demanded by Christ of His followers: "He that is not with me is against me" (Matt. 12:30). "Who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of mortal man, and of the son of man, who shall wither away like grass, and thou hast forgotten the Lord, thy Maker, who stretched out the heavens and founded the earth" (Isa. 51:12, 13).

Human respect on the part of Catholics keeps many a man of good faith outside the pale of the Church. "Now, when you sin thus against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ" (I Cor. 8:12).

Human respect as a life's program and philosophy will bar many from the mansions of eternal light: "He that shall be ashamed of me and my words, of him the Son of Man shall be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty" (Luke 9:26).

Catholics need sorely today something of that legitimate and laudable pride which impelled St. Paul to cry out: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel" (Rom. 1:16).

—Fr. Thomas Schwertner, O.P., in *The Rosary: A Social Remedy* (2nd edition, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952), pp. 48 f.

Analecta

A Letter from the Holy Office

Ex Aedibus S. Officii, die 8.a augusti 1949

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO
SANCTI OFFICII

Protoc. Num. 122/49
(In responsione fiat mentio huius numeri)

Excellentissime ac Rev. me Domine,

Suprema haec Sacra Congregatio perattente ortum ac progressum prosecuta est gravis controversiae quae a nonnullis sociis institutorum "St. Benedict Center" et "Boston College" excitata est circa interpretationem illius effati *"extra Ecclesiam nulla salus."*

Quum autem omnia documenta ad rem necessaria vel utilia perspecta fuerint, inter quae sive notitiae ab ista Curia receptae, sive recursus et relationes, quibus socii instituti "St. Benedict Center" suas opiniones querelasque exponunt, sive etiam plura alia ad controversiam spectantia ex officio collecta, eadem Sacra Congregatio sibi persuasum habet, deploratam controversiam ortam esse ex eo quod effatum illud "extra Ecclesiam nulla salus" non recte comprehensum ponderatumque fuerit, eandemque exacerbatam ex gravi disciplinae perturbatione, qua nonnulli sodales institutorum quae supra memorata sunt, obsequium et oboedientiam erga legitimas auctoritates dectrectaverint.

Itaque Eminentissimi ac Rev. mi Patres Cardinales Supremae huius S. Congregationis, in conventu plenario, Feria IV, die 27 iulii 1949 habito, decreverunt et Augustus Pontifex in Audientia sequentis Feriae V, diei 28 iulii 1949, approbare dignatus est, ut dentur explanationes quae sequuntur ad doctrinam pertinentes, itemque invitamenta atque exhortationes, quae ad disciplinam spectant, tradantur:

Fide divina et catholica ea omnia credere tenemur, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesia non tantum

solemni iudicio, sed etiam ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur. (Denzinger n. 1792)

Inter ea autem, quae semper Ecclesia praedicavit et praedicare numquam desinet, illud quoque infallibile effatum continetur, quo edocemur *extra Ecclesiam nullam esse salutem.*

Est tamen hoc dogma intelligendum eo sensu, quo id intelligit Ecclesia ipsa. Non enim privatis iudiciis explicanda dedit Salvator Noster ea, quae in fidei deposito continentur, sed ecclesiastico magisterio.

Et primum quidem Ecclesia docet, hac in re agi de severissimo praecepto Iesu Christi. Ipse enim expressis verbis Apostolis suis imposuit ut docerent omnes gentes servare omnia quaecumque Ipse mandaverat. (Matth. XXVIII, 19-20)

Inter mandata autem Christi non minimum locum illud occupat quo Baptismo iubemur incorporari in Corpus Mysticum Christi, quod est Ecclesia, et adhaerere Christo Eiusque Vicario, per quem Ipse in terra modo visibili gubernat Ecclesiam.

Quare nemo salvabitur qui, sciens Ecclesiam a Christo divinitus fuisse institutam, tamen Ecclesiae sese subiicere renuit vel Romano Pontifici, Christi in terris Vicario, denegat oboedientiam.

Neque enim in praecepto tantummodo dedit Salvator ut omnes gentes intrarent Ecclesiam, sed statuit quoque Ecclesiam medium esse salutis, sine quo nemo intrare valeat regnum gloriae caelestis.

Infinita sua misericordia Deus voluit ut illorum auxiliorum salutis quae divina sola institutione, non vero intrinseca necessitate, ad finem ultimum ordinantur, tunc quoque certis in adiunctis effectus ad salutem necessarii obtineri valeant, ubi *voto* solummodo vel *desiderio* adhibeantur. Quod in Sacrosancto Tridentino Concilio claris verbis enuntiatum videmus tum de Sacramento Regenerationis tum de Sacramento Poenitentiae. (Denzinger, nn. 797, 807)

Idem autem suo modo dici debet de Ecclesia, quatenus generale Ipsa auxilium salutis est. Quandoquidem ut quis aeternam obtineat salutem, non semper exigitur ut *reapse* Ecclesiae tamquam membrum incorporetur, sed il saltem requiritur, ut eidem *voto* et *desiderio* adhaereat.

Hoc tamen votum non semper explicitum sit oportet, prout accidit in catechumenis: sed ubi homo invincibili ignorantia laborat,

Deus quoque *implicitum votum* acceptat, tali nomine nuncupatum, quia illud in ea bona animae dispositione continetur, qua homo voluntatem suam Dei voluntati conformem velit.

Quae clare edocentur in dogmaticis illis Litteris a Summo Pontifice PIO Papa XII, die 29 iunii 1943 editis "De Mystico Iesu Christi Corpore." (A. A. Sedis, vol. XXXV, a. 1943, p. 193 ss.) In iisdem enim Summus Pontifex nitide distinguit inter eos, qui *re* Ecclesiae tamquam membra incorporantur, atque eos qui *voto* tantummodo Ecclesiae adhaerent.

Agens enim de membris, quibus Corpus Mysticum hisce in terris componitur (A. S. Sedis, l. cit., pag. 202) idem Augustus Pontifex dicit: "In Ecclesiae autem membris *reapse* ii soli adnumerandi sunt qui regenerationis lavacrum receperunt veramque fidem profitentur neque a Corporis compage semet ipsos misere separaverunt vel, ob gravissima admissa, a legitima auctoritate seiuncti sunt."

Circa finem autem earundem Litterarum Encyclicarum, amantissimo animo eos ad unitatem invitans, qui ad Ecclesiae Catholicae compagem non pertinent, illos commemorat "qui inscio quodam *desiderio* ac *voto* ad Mysticum Redemptoris Corpus ordinentur" quos minime a salute aeterna excludit, ex altera tamen parte in tali statu versari asserit "in quo de sempiterna cuiusque propria salute securi esse non possunt . . . quandoquidem tot tantis caelestibus muneribus adiumentis carent, quibus in Catholica solummodo Ecclesia frui licet." (A. A. Sedis, l. c., pag. 243)

Quibus verbis providentibus tam eos reprobat, qui omnes *solo voto implicito* Ecclesiae adhaerentes a salute aeterna excludunt, quam eos qui falso asserunt homines in omni religione aequaliter salvari posse. (Cfr. PII Pp. IX Allocut. "Singulari quadam" apud Denzinger, nn. 1646 ss.—item eiusdem PII Pp. IX Litt. Encycl. "Quanto conficiamur moerore" apud Denz. n. 1677.)

Neque etiam putandum est quodcumque votum Ecclesiae ingrediendae sufficere ut homo salvetur. Requiritur enim ut votum quo quis ad Ecclesiam ordinetur, perfecta caritate informetur: nec *votum implicitum* effectum habere potest, nisi homo fidem habeat supernaturalem: "Credere enim oportet accedentem ad Deum quia est et inquirentibus se remunerator sit." (Hebr. XI, 6.) Ait enim Concil. Trident. (Sess. VI, cap. 8.) "Fides est humanae salutis initium, fundamentum et radix omnis iustificationis, sine qua im-

possible est placere Deo et ad filiorum Eius consortium pervenire." (Denz. n. 801)

Ex praedictis clarum igitur est, ea quae in commentario "From the Housetops" fasc. III, tamquam genuina Ecclesiae Catholicae doctrina proponuntur, ab eadem longe distare et esse valde nociva tam iis qui intra quam iis qui foris sunt.

Ex hisce declarationibus, quae ad doctrinam attinent, nonnulla consequuntur, quae ad disciplinam et modum sese gerendi spectant, quaeque ignorari nequeunt ab iis qui strenue defendunt necessitatem, qua omnes adstringuntur, Ecclesiam veram participandi et sese subiiciendi auctoritati Romani Pontificis et Episcoporum *"quos Spiritus Sanctus posuit . . . regere Ecclesiam."* (Act. XX, 28)

Itaque intelligi non potest quomodo Institutum "St. Benedict Center" sibi cohaereat, quod, quum se scholam catholicam profiteatur ac talem haberi velit, re tamen vera praescriptis canonum 1381 et 1382 Codicis Iuris Canonici non conformetur, idemque fons exsistat discordiarum et rebellionis contra auctoritatem ecclesiasticam et turbationis multarum conscientiarum causa.

Item non intelligitur quomodo religiosus vir, scilicet Pater Feeney, se "defensorem fidei" exhibeat, simulque impugnare non dubitet catecheticam institutionem, a legitimis auctoritatibus propositam, neque veritus sit incurrere in graves sanctiones a sacris canonibus comminatas ob graves ipsius transgressiones contra officia religiosi, sacerdotis et simplicis quoque fidelis.

Denique minime tolerandum est quosdam catholicos sibi tribuere velle ius publicandi commentarium, ad doctrinas theologicas evulgandas, sine competentis Auctoritatis Ecclesiasticae licentia quae "imprimatur" dicitur, ut sacris canonibus cautum est.

Sedulo igitur animadvertant illi qui in gravi discrimine adversus Ecclesiam versantur, semet ipsos, postquam *"Roma locuta est"* ne excusari quidem posse bonae fidei rationibus. Eorum sane vinculum et oboedientiae officium erga Ecclesiam multo est gravius, quam eorum qui "adhuc nonnisi inscio quodam voto" ad Ecclesiam ordinantur: considerent enim se esse filios Ecclesiae, ab Eadem lacte doctrinae et Sacramentorum pie enutritos, ideoque sese, audita clara voce Matris, ab ignorantia culpabili excusari non posse, et hac de causa de ipsis absque ulla restrictione valere verbum illud: subiectionem Ecclesiae Catholicae et Summo Pontifici debitam esse de necessitate salutis.

Quae dum Tecum communico impensam meam observantiam Tibi obtestor, permanens

Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae
addictissimus
✠ F. Card. Marchetti-Selvaggiani
Secret.

A. Ottaviani
Adsessor

Exc.mo ac Rev.mo Domino
D.no RICHARDO JACOBO CUSHING
Archiepiscopo Bostoniensi
BOSTONIAM

The Official English Translation

THE SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

From the Headquarters of the
Holy Office

August 8, 1949.

Protocol Number 122/49.

Your Excellency:

This Supreme Sacred Congregation has followed very attentively the rise and the course of the grave controversy stirred up by certain associates of "St. Benedict Center" and "Boston College" in regard to the interpretation of that axiom: *"Outside the Church there is no salvation."*

After having examined all the documents that are necessary or useful in this matter, among them information from your Chancery, as well as appeals and reports in which the associates of "St. Benedict Center" explain their opinions and complaints, and also many other documents pertinent to the controversy, officially collected, the same Sacred Congregation is convinced that the unfortunate controversy arose from the fact that the axiom: "outside the Church there is no salvation," was not correctly understood and weighed, and that the same controversy was rendered

more bitter by serious disturbance of discipline arising from the fact that some of the associates of the institutions mentioned above refused reverence and obedience to legitimate authorities.

Accordingly, the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinals of this Supreme Congregation, in a plenary session, held on Wednesday, July 27, 1949, decreed, and the August Pontiff in an audience on the following Thursday, July 28, 1949, deigned to give his approval, that the following explanations pertinent to the doctrine, and also that invitations and exhortations relevant to discipline be given:

We are bound by divine and Catholic faith to believe all those things which are contained in the word of God, whether it be Scripture or Tradition, and are proposed by the Church to be believed as divinely revealed, not only through solemn judgment but also through the ordinary and universal teaching office (Denzinger, n. 1792).

Now, among those things which the Church has always preached and will never cease to preach is contained also that infallible statement by which we are taught that there is no salvation outside the Church.

However, this dogma must be understood in that sense in which the Church herself understands it. For, it was not to private judgments that Our Saviour gave for explanation those things that are contained in the deposit of faith, but to the teaching authority of the Church.

Now, in the first place, the Church teaches that in this matter there is question of a most strict command of Jesus Christ. For He explicitly enjoined on His apostles to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He Himself had commanded (Matt., 28:19-20).

Now, among the commandments of Christ, that one holds not the least place, by which we are commanded to be incorporated by Baptism into the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to His Vicar, through whom He Himself in a visible manner governs the Church on earth.

Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth.

Not only did the Saviour command that all nations should enter the Church, but He also decreed the Church to be a means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of eternal glory.

In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation which are directed toward man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when those helps are used only in *desire* and *longing*. This we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the Sacrament of Regeneration and in reference to the Sacrament of Penance (Denzinger, nn. 797, 807).

The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, in as far as she is the general help to salvation. Therefore, that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by *desire* and *longing*.

However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an *implicit desire*, so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.

These things are clearly taught in that dogmatic letter which was issued by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, on June 29, 1943, "On the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ." (AAS, Vol. 35, an. 1943, p. 193 ff.). For in this letter the Sovereign Pontiff clearly distinguishes between those who are *actually* incorporated into the Church as members, and those who are united to the Church only *by desire*.

Discussing the members of which the Mystical Body is composed here on earth, the same August Pontiff says: "Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith, and who have not been so unfortunate as to separate themselves from the unity of the Body, or been excluded by legitimate authority for grave faults committed."

Toward the end of this same Encyclical Letter, when most affectionately inviting to unity those who do not belong to the body of the Catholic Church, he mentions those who "are related

to the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a certain unconscious *yearning* and *desire,*" and these he by no means excludes from eternal salvation, but on the other hand states that they are in a condition "in which they cannot be sure of their salvation" since "they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church" (AAS, loc. cit., 243).

With these wise words he reproves both those who exclude from eternal salvation all united to the Church *only by implicit desire,* and those who falsely assert that men can be saved equally well in every religion (cf. Pope Pius IX, Allocution "Singulari quadam," in Denzinger, nn. 1641, ff.—also Pope Pius IX in the Encyclical Letter "Quanto conficiamur moerore" in Denzinger, n. 1677).

But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect, unless a person has supernatural faith: "For he who comes to God must believe that God exists and is a rewarder of those who seek Him" (Hebrews, 11:6). The Council of Trent declares (Session VI, chap. 8): "Faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain to the fellowship of His children" (Denzinger, n. 801).

From what has been said it is evident that those things which are proposed in the periodical "From the Housetops," fascicle 3, as the genuine teaching of the Catholic Church are far from being such and are very harmful both to those within the Church and those without.

From these declarations which pertain to doctrine certain conclusions follow which regard discipline and conduct, and which cannot be unknown to those who vigorously defend the necessity by which all are bound of belonging to the true Church and of submitting to the authority of the Roman Pontiff and of the Bishops "whom the Holy Ghost has placed . . . to rule the Church" (Acts, 20:28).

Hence, one cannot understand how the St. Benedict Center can consistently claim to be a Catholic school and wish to be accounted

such, and yet not conform to the prescriptions of Canons 1381 and 1382 of the Code of Canon Law, and continue to exist as a source of discord and rebellion against ecclesiastical authority and as a source of the disturbance of many consciences.

Furthermore, it is beyond understanding how a member of a religious institute, namely Father Feeney, presents himself as a "Defender of the faith," and at the same time does not hesitate to attack the catechetical instruction proposed by lawful authorities, and has not even feared to incur grave sanctions threatened by the sacred canons because of his serious violations of his duties as a religious, a priest and an ordinary member of the Church.

Finally, it is in no wise to be tolerated that certain Catholics shall claim for themselves the right to publish a periodical, for the purpose of spreading theological doctrines, without the permission of competent Church Authority, called the "imprimatur," which is prescribed by the sacred canons.

Therefore, let them who in grave peril are ranged against the Church seriously bear in mind that after "Rome has spoken" they cannot be excused even by reasons of good faith. Certainly, their bond and duty of obedience toward the Church is much graver than that of those who as yet are related to the Church "only by an unconscious desire." Let them realize that they are children of the Church, lovingly nourished by her with the milk of doctrine and the sacraments, and hence, having heard the clear voice of their Mother, they cannot be excused from culpable ignorance, and therefore to them applies without any restriction that principle: submission to the Catholic Church and to the Sovereign Pontiff is required as necessary for salvation.

In sending this letter, I declare my profound esteem, and remain

Your Excellency's most devoted

F. Cardinal Marchetti-Selvaggiani

A. Ottaviani
Assessor

To His Excellency
Most Reverend Richard James Cushing
Archbishop of Boston

Book Reviews

THE ROMAN RITUALS. Volume I—The Sacraments and Processions; Volume II—Christian Burial, Exorcisms, Reserved Blessings; Volume III—The Blessings. Translated, edited, and annotated by the Rev. Philip T. Weller. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1952. The set: $25.00. $8.75 ea.

The complete and authentic text of our contemporary Roman Ritual now presented for the first time in Latin and English, with rubrical directions and titles printed in red exactly as in the original in this handsome Weller edition, will we devoutly trust find an increasingly wider use among our American clergy, and they in turn introduce the laity to its precious content. This latter has now, according to an unblushing but literally true comment of a blurb-writer, "been released from its prison in the sacristy," to be at the disposal of all the baptized as well as ordained sharers of Christ's priesthood, to their immense potential profit and edification.

Handily divided into three octavo volumes of approximately 500 pages each, of which the final one has just appeared (actually it is Vol. II in the series; Vol. III having been printed first, in 1946; and Vol. I in 1950), this monumental work makes accessible to all what is undoubtedly the richest repository of the Church's living tradition of faith and worship, outside of Missal and Breviary. Best of all, the high quality of its craftsmanship, as well as the general excellence of its English style, are well worthy of the sanctities it enshrines. Significantly too, its appearance is closely contemporary with that of our present Holy Father's famous Encyclical on the liturgy, *Mediator Dei*, a charter containing numerous admonitions and directives which, thanks to this fine translation, we can now more easily fulfill. For example, we are reminded by the Holy Father that even private forms of piety should "prepare (us) to take part in sacred public functions with greater fruit, and . . . lessen the danger of liturgical prayers becoming an empty ritualism" (par. 175 in NCWC edition). Indeed, the Encyclical's single aim, in the Holy Father's concluding words, is that all Catholics "may more fully understand and appreciate the precious treasures that are contained in the sacred liturgy" (par. 205).

While we cannot attempt at this point to give a critical evaluation of its vast and varied content from the standpoint of fidelity of translation, not to mention the niceties of of literary style, it is the considered

opinion of this reviewer that as a whole, Father Weller's rendition is accurate, clear, dignified. In addition, it is idiomatic as could be expected, in a work of this kind; it is forceful, indeed often exceptionally beautiful, in its phrasing. This is indeed a remarkable achievement, considering the well-known obscurity of the Latin in so many places. The translator's success in dealing with such passages averages high, in our opinion; although purists may find plenty of grounds on which to differ. As random examples of this, in which freedom of rendition was exercised but without affecting the essential meaning, we cite the following, from Volume II: the prayer in the *Blessing of an Expectant Mother* (p. 124) contains the phrase *"custode partem tuam, et defende,"* which is here translated, obviously in view of the context, as "guard her lying-in, and defend her"; and then, there is this rendition, on a similar basis, of the phrase *"praevaricatione primi hominis per ligni vetiti sumptionem"* in the *Solemn Blessing of a Cross* (p. 280) as: "in Adam's deception at the accursed tree of Paradise."

Indeed, considering the incredibly rich and varied doctrinal and moral content with which he had to deal, much of it never before translated into English, we can only express amazement at Father Weller's extremely competent and smooth flowing rendition. Though a truly pioneer effort, it must be accorded high rank among works of its kind; and from the standard of practical utility, its value of course can hardly be exaggerated. Both for the busy pastor, who so often is heard to bemoan his flock's stolid unfamiliarity with the commonest sacramental ministrations, and for the lay person desirous of linking these latter more closely with his personal spirituality, this is a veritable treasure-trove. Prayers, ceremonies, instructions, all expressive of Mother Church's own spiritual attitudes developed throughout the centuries, and apropos of almost every human spiritual circumstance and need, now become as it were the familiar property of us all; for which American and British (empire) Catholics will be (we hope) duly appreciative, by their copious and frequent use of the Weller Ritual.

D. Michael Ducey, O.S.B.

Psychiatry and Catholicism. By James H. Van der Veldt, O.F.M., Ph.D., and Robert P. Odenwald, M.D., F.A.P.A. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952. Pp. ix + 433. $6.00.

This important work is by two members of the staff of The Catholic University of America. Father Van der Veldt, a native of Holland, is a psychologist who has previously taught at the Athenaeum Antonianum and the University of the Propagation of the Faith in Rome, and is now Professor of Psychology at the Washington institution. Dr.

Odenwald, whose medical and psychiatric studies were made in various German universities, is a psychiatrist. He is director of the Child Center and Assistant Professor of Psychiatry at The Catholic University of America.

The importance of the work may be judged by the great range of topics treated, by the competence of the authors both in the religio-philosophic aspects and the practical medical aspects of the subject matter, and by the fact that this seems to be the first large-scale attempt in English to synthesize modern psychiatric concepts with traditional Catholic thought.

The book is expository, practical, conciliatory and critical, with the principal emphasis on exposition. For the professional psychiatrist and psychologist, whether he be a Catholic or not, but especially in the latter case, there is a clear explanation of the Catholic position on the nature of the human composite, on the moral law, conscience, responsibility, and on free will. For the non-professional person there are excellent general chapters on the historical development of psychiatric science, on the psychosomatic concept of disease, on the therapeutic methods of psychiatry, especially depth therapy, on counselling, and on the work of the psychiatric team of psychiatrist, clinical psychologist and social worker. The chapters on "Religion and Psychiatry" and "The Priest and Mental Health" are particularly good. To the present reviewer these chapters in the first half of the book were the most valuable. The second half of the book takes up more particular topics, explaining the psychoses in general, epileptic psychoses and other psychoses with an organic basis, the psychoneuroses, psychopathic personalities, and mental deficiency. The final chapters deal with the practical problems of scrupulosity, alcoholism, masturbation, frigidity, impotence, homosexuality, sex education, and the psychiatric aspects of marriage problems. The greater part of the book, therefore, is expository and practical.

But I have said that the work is also conciliatory and critical. It is conciliatory in the sense that it explains Catholic religious and philosophical ideas to the psychiatrist in his language, and explains psychiatric ideas to the lay person and to the Catholic clergy in language they can understand. The result is that the field of apparent conflict is minimized, a sense of the value and "legitimacy" of modern psychiatry is inculcated, and both priest and psychiatrist have a clearer idea of where the work of one leaves off and that of the other begins. The conclusion of common sense is explicity and scientifically developed: "Religion is no substitute for psychiatry, nor psychiatry a substitute for religion."

As for criticism, the book devotes a long chapter to the evaluation of psychoanalysis, after first describing at length the various depth therapies. The authors recognize the contributions of the dynamic approach, and frequently in the later practical sections of the book rely on theories of the dynamic unconscious to explain morbid symptoms. But they do not attempt the impossible task of reconciling the irreconcilable, or of trying to show that Freud was not such a determinist, or materialist, or atheist, after all. Freud's irreligious philosophy is portrayed in a forthright manner and there is no minimizing the real practical dangers of submitting to psychoanalysis at the hands of Freudian therapists who introduce, as some of them do, false philosophical, religious or moral values into their treatment of the patient. The present reviewer feels especially indebted to the authors for the following statement which points out the dangers without condemning the method. (A similar reserve is desiderated in the works of certain of Freud's admirers of the French Catholic school.) Fr. VanderVeldt and Dr. Odenwald conclude their evaluation of psychoanalysis as follows:

> Although recognizing the abuses that have characterized the work of many psychoanalysts precisely because they mix method with philosophy, Catholic psychiatrists look upon analysis of the mind as a valid means of serving their anxious, disturbed, and neurotic fellow men. They feel that it would be incongruous, for example, to refuse the use of an effective make of safety razor because it was invented by an atheist. Likewise, they see nothing wrong in using an efficient psychiatric technique even though it has been offered to the world by one who, in his research on man's nature, lost sight of God Who gave him the perspicacity for inventing that technique. In the light of these considerations, one understands also the answer to the question of whether psychoanalysis is dangerous to the religious faith of the patient. It is not dangerous but actually an asset when it is administered by a psychiatrist who has his own two feet solidly on the bedrock of Christian philosophy, but it is dangerous, and very much so, when the psychiatrist is guided, not only by the analytical technique, but also by the materialistic philosophy of human nature which Freud championed so ardently.

The criticism of the non-directive (or client-centered) counselling techniques of Carl Rogers brings out some points which have not been treated elsewhere, especially the opinion of Rogers himself, orally expressed, "that either Catholics do not grasp the implications of the client-centered therapy, and in that case they will necessarily do superficial work, or they do grasp those implications, and in that case it is difficult to see how they can avoid a serious conflict with their belief." Among the points of Catholic belief at issue are original sin and the external authority of the Church as interpreter of the objective moral law of God. Client-centered therapy, say the authors, is an inner re-